JACOB IBN ADONIJAH'S
INTRODUCTION
TO THE RABBINIC BIBLE,

HEBREW AND ENGLISH.

BY CHRISTIAN D. GINSBURG, LL.D.

B. WESTERMANN & Co.
NEW-YORK
838 BROADWAY

6.28.'02

From the Library of
Professor William Henry Green
Bequeathed by him to
the Library of
Princeton Theological Seminary

BS 18
.J15
COPY 1

THE KABBALAH: its Doctrines, Development, and Literature. An Essay read before the Literary and Philsophical Society of Liverpool, October 19, 1863, and reprinted with the Society's permission.—Price 7s. 6d. London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer.

THE MASSORETH HA-MASSORETH of ELIAS LEVITA, in Hebrew, with an English Translation, and Explanatory Notes.—Price 21s. London: Longmans. 1867.

"The work will be a welcome addition to the libraries of all sound Hebraists, and we should be glad to hear that its laborious editor was engaged on a scientific treatise, making the whole subject of Massoretic criticism available to European scholars."—*The London Review.*

"Dr. Ginsburg's translation of Elias Levita on the 'Massoreth,' is a work of the greatest utility to the Hebrew student."—*Westminster Review.*

"The Introduction by Dr. Ginsburg is exceedingly interesting, and very valuable in the present state of Hebrew literature in this country. We have here the history of the life and times of Elias Levita, and a most instructive *résumé* of the literature of that period. The translation is free, easy, natural; the notes are brief, pointed, practical, and give evidence of the most comprehensive and detailed acquaintance with the whole subject. Several important errors are corrected, which mar even our most recent authorities. We feel assured that many Hebrew scholars, who have hitherto been satisfied with modern scientific helps, will gratefully avail themselves of the present means of making their acquaintance with the old native authorities, and that as many as will make the attempt will not be disappointed."—*The English Independent.*

"We must heartily thank Dr. Ginsburg for this befitting companion to Jacob ben Chajim, and the Kabbalah. The value of the volume before us is greatly enhanced by the fact that the present is the only reliable and complete translation of the work; the two which exist, the one in Latin, and the other in German, being exceedingly imperfect. The Introduction is replete with the most valuable and interesting information. We have a concise and clear account of the life and times of Elias Levita, and a most instructive *résumé* of the literature of that period. It furnishes numerous corrections of errors which mar some of our most recent information upon the subjects in hand. The translation is clear, easy, and natural. Shemitic scholars, who have hitherto been satisfied with modern scientific aids, by the help furnished them here will be able successfully to wade through the intricacies of the old native authorities. . . . We feel assured that the present work will be a most welcome addition to the library of every sound Hebraist."—*British Quarterly Review.*

"We offer hearty thanks to Dr. Ginsburg, who gives us books that can bring no adequate reward to their author, but can and will establish his claim to the remembrance and gratitude of scholars universally."—*The Nonconformist.*

"Such scholarship as Dr. Ginsburg's will always be rare: it requires historical and other conditions which are not often to be found together. All the more highly let it be set store by when it does present itself. For ourselves, we are grateful to Dr. Ginsburg both for his studies and for the fruit of them; and we receive his English *Levita* as one of the best contributions which recent years have made to the cause of Hebrew learning and of Old Testament criticism, whether in this or any other country."—*The London Review.*

JACOB BEN CHAJIM'S INTRODUCTION TO THE RABBINIC BIBLE, Hebrew and English; with Explanatory Notes. Second Edition, much enlarged.—Price 7s. 6d. London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer.

"This is a valuable and curious contribution to Biblical literature."—
Clerical Journal.

WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

THE SONG OF SONGS, with an Historical and Critical Commentary.—Price 10s. London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer.

> "Its poetical beauty has certainly not been impaired in Mr. Ginsburg's hands. . . . . Much of what Mr. Ginsburg has done is so good, and the class of works so completely deserves encouragement, that we shall be glad if the success of his first effort encourages him to continue his Biblical labours."—*Saturday Review.*
>
> "Whoso is tempted by its luscious light, streaming through laden vine-boughs, 'dripping odours, dripping wine,' that would gaze on the tessellated floors of ivory palaces, and pierce through silken lattices into chambers dedicated to a bridal, that would crush spikenard and musk under his feet, and listen to the voice of bridegroom and bride, let him turn to these pages, and learn all the curious lore which a sedulous and erudite scholar has amassed to illustrate this new translation of the story of the Shulamite."—*Athenæum.*

COHELETH, commonly called THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES, Translated from the Original Hebrew, with a Commentary, Historical and Critical.—Price 18s. London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer.

> "Anything so complete and important has never appeared before in our language upon the Book of Ecclesiastes. We can readily understand that the author has bestowed seven years' labour upon it; and we cannot too strongly praise his diligence, research, and learning."—*Clerical Journal.*
>
> "A valuable contribution both to its exegesis and its literary history. . . . The opinions of so competent a Hebrew scholar as Mr. Ginsburg cannot be consulted without profit, even though they may not be correct in every instance."—*The Literary Churchman.*
>
> "The notes are replete with good sense as well as learning, and the main points for discussion are brought out in the introduction with a clear and masterly hand."—*The Spectator.*
>
> "The work is the acutest, the fairest, the most learned, every way the ablest and most trustworthy work on Ecclesiastes in our language, and perhaps the best in any language."—*The Critic.*
>
> "This is one of those learned efforts of Biblical criticism into which the laborious intellect of Germany has for some time thrown itself with so much earnestness of purpose."—*John Bull.*

THE ESSENES; THEIR HISTORY AND DOCTRINES. An Essay, Reprinted from the Transactions of the Literary and Philosophical Society of Liverpool.—Price 2s. London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer.

> "This is certainly a very good account of that remarkable sect, whose peculiarities elicited a measure of admiration even from the Greeks and Romans, and exercised some influence upon Christianity. Dr. Ginsburg is of opinion that the common sources of information are not ample enough to enable us to understand sufficiently the doctrines and habits of the Essenes; and accordingly he professes to furnish a more complete and accurate account, founded upon his researches among ancient and modern authors."—*English Churchman.*
>
> "Dr. Ginsburg's paper on *The Essenes, their History and Doctrines,* . . is an exhaustive essay, on a subject on which it is curious that there should be so much obscurity."—*Guardian.*
>
> "The book will be valuable as a manual for reference, in consequence of its numerous facts; and students of Hebrew and Christian antiquities should have it at hand."—*Journal of Sacred Literature.*

T

Tam, 57, 62, 63.
Tagin, Sepher, see Book of Crowns.
Talavera, Fray Fernando de, 2.
Talmud, the, *editio princeps* of, 5; its explanation of Nehemiah viii. 8, 48; differences between it and the Massorah, 42, 57, 58, 63, 64, 65; the different Tracts of it quoted:—
  Baba Mezia, 54 *b* . . . 62, 63.
  Baba Bathra, 111. . . . . 63.
  Erechin, 17 *a* . . . . . 74, 75.
  Gittin, 86 . . . . 67.
  Jebamoth, 106 *b* . . 66, 71, 72.
  ———— 13 *b* . . . . . . 53.
  ———— Jerusalem, i. 6 . 53.
  Kethuboth, 104 *a* . . . . . 36.
  Kiddushin, 30 *a* . . . . . 15.
  Megilla, Jerusalem, i. 11 . . 53.
  ——— 9 *a* . . . . 71.
  ——— 24 *b* . . . . 63.
  ——— 25 *b* . . . . . 45, 51.
  Menachoth, 34 *a b* . 59, 61, 62.
  Maccoth, Jerusalem, ii. 7 . . 39.
  Nedarim, 37 *b* . . . 48, 49, 55, 57, 70, 71.
  Nidda, 33 *a* . . . . 57.
  Pessachim, 16 *b* . . . . . 74.
  ———— 103 *b*,—104 *a*, 75, 76.
  Rosh Ha-Shana, 4 . . . . 32.
  Sabbath, 55 *b* . . . . . 57, 59.
  ———— 103 *b* . . . . . 60.
  Sanhedrin, 4 *b* . . . . . 60.
  Shebiith, Jerusalem, v. 1 . . 37.
  Sopherim vii. 1 . . . . . 65.
  ———— vi. 4 . . 52, 53, 55.
  ———— vi. 8 . . . . . 50.
  ———— vi. 9 . . . . . 50.
  ———— vii. 2 . . . . . 53.
  Sopherim viii. 8 . . . . . 45.
  ———— ix. 9 . . . . . 51.
  Sota, 20 *a* . . . . 39.
  Succa, 6 *b* . . . . 74.
  ——— 46 *b* . . . . 61.
  Taanith, 4 *b* . . . . 61.
  Taharoth . . . . 12.
  Zebachim, 24 *b* . . . . . 62.
  ———— 115 *b* . . . . 53.
  ———— Mishna, xiv. 4 . 53.
Tikun Sopherim, 42 . . . 48, 68, 69.
Tossafoth, 57, 58; mentions variations between the readings of the Talmud and the Massorah, argues from the Massorah against the Talmud, 60-63, 71, 72, 74.
Tunis, the supposed birth-place of Jacob b. Chajim, 2, 3.
Tunisi, see Jacob b. Chajim.

V

Vav, the middle in the Pentateuch, 15.
Verse, the middle in the Pentateuch, 15; in the Psalms, 15.

W

Weiss, his commentary on the Mechilta, 71.
Word, the middle in the Pentateuch, 15.

X

Ximenes, Cardinal, goes to Granada to convert the Mussulmans, 2; causes the destruction of Arabic MSS, 3; triumphantly enters Oran, 4; does not describe the materials used in the Complutensian Polyglott, 22, 23.

Z

Zunz, 24, 41.

D. MARPLES, PRINTER, LIVERPOOL.

Massoretic sign explained, 72, 73.
Mechilta, 10, 69, 71.
Meier, of Rottenburg, 77.
——— b. Samuel, 57.
——— Rabbi, 59, 60.
Michaelis, 35.
Midrash Rabboth, 10, 59, 64.
——— Ruth, 37.
——— Tanchuma, 10.
——— Tilim, 10.
Mishrachi, Elias, 10.
Moors, crusade against them, 2.
Mordecai b. Hillel, 76, 77.
Morinus, 35.
Moses, the Punctuator, or *Ha-Nakdan*, 7, 18.
——— b. Nachman, see Ramban.
Mezuzah, 59.
Mozarquiver captured by the Spaniards, 23.

N

Nachmanides, see Ramban.
Nathan, Isaac, 5, 80, 81.
——— b. Jechiel, 41.
Navarro, Pedro, conquers Bugia, 4.
Nehemiah, Rabbi, 53.
Neubauer, 24.
Norzi, Salomon, 24, 25.

O

Ochla Ve-Ochla, origin of its name, 16, 17, 19; declared by Levita to be the basis of the present Massorah, refuted, 23, 24, 26, 27; whether it is the identical one quoted by Kimchi, Ibn Aknim, Isaac b. Jehudah, Elias Levita, 25; is edited by Dr. Frensdorff, 26; its relation to the Massorah of Jacob b. Chajim, 25-27; to the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* quoted by the mediæval lexicographers, 28; its age, 33, 34; Frensdorff's edition quoted, 45, 49, 50, 51, 64, 65, 69.
Onkelos, 6.

P

Papa, Rabbi, 59.
Paris Massorah, edited under the name of *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, see Frensdorff and *Ochla Ve-Ochla*.
Pentateuch, the, divided into Sabbatic lessons, the manner in which it is quoted in Jewish writings, 45.
Pesicta Sutrata, 10.
Phylacteries, 61.
Pinsker, 69.
Pizzightone, David de, 5.
Plato, 70.
Polyglott, Complutensian, 3, 22.
Prescott, 3.
Prophiat Duran, see Ephodi.
Ptolemy, king, 69.

R

Rab, 48.
Rabe, 71, 72.
Rabbinic Bible, see Bible.
Ralbag, also called Rabbi Levi b. Gershon, 6, 7, 10.
Rambam, see Maimonides.
Ramban, also called Moses b. Nachman, or Nachmanides, 10, 39, 40, 56.
Rashba, 55.
Rashbam, 39, 40, 57.
Rashban, also called R. Samuel b. Meier, 39, 40, 57.
Rashi, 6, 7, 24, 34, 49, 50, 51; his interpretation of 1 Samuel ii. 24; differs from the Massoretic text, 57-59, 60, 61, 63, 64, 65, 66, 70.
Raymond Martin, 67.
Redak, see Kimchi.
Reformation, 6.
Reifmann, his opinion on the commentaries ascribed to Ibn Ezra, 7.
Riba, see Isaac b. Asher.
Riban, see Jehudah b. Nathan.
Rossi, Azzariah de, his date, calls Jacob b. Chajim Ibn Adonijah, 1.
Rottenburg, Meier, 76.
Rules, exegetical, 60-63.

S

Saadia Gaon, 7, 34, 64, 65.
Sabba, Abraham, 10.
Sabbatical lessons, see Pentateuch.
Saccutto, Abraham, 2; emigrates from Tunis, 4.
Salomon, b. Abraham b. Adereth, 10.
——— b. Isaac, see Rashi.
——— b. Jehudah, see Norzi.
Samaritans, the, refuse to adopt the revision of the text, 53.
Samuel, b. Meier, see Rashbam.
——— Mar, 59.
——— Rabbi, 57.
Scribes, see Sopherim.
Septuagint, the, 69.
Shimshon b. Abraham, 12.
Simeon, Rabbi, 74.
Simon, the Just, 37.
——— b. Lakish, 52.
Siphra, 10.
Siphri, 10.
Soave, Moses, 12.
Sopherim, the origin of their name, 15, 43; members of the Great Synagogue, 37; authors of the *Keri* and *Kethiv*, 43; their emendations of the text, 42, 48, 49, 67-69.
Spain, expulsion of the Jews from, 2.
Steinschneider, 10, 17, 24, 41.
Synagogue, the Great, its origin and constitution, 37; the members thereof, the compilers of the Hebrew canon, the Book of Esther, &c, 37, 38; the authors of the *Keri* and *Kethiv*, 42, 43, 70.

H

Halle MS. of the Massorah, described 28-30; its relation to the printed Massorah of Jacob b. Chajim, 30, 31; to the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, 31-33; its date, 34.
Hannael, Rabbi, 48.
Haphtara, see Pentateuch.
Heretics, see Christians.
Hunnah, Joshua, 57, 59.
Hupfeld, his description of the Halle MS. Massorah, 28.
Havdalah, 75.

I

Ibn Adonijah, see Jacob ben Chajim.
Ibn Aknin quotes the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, 24, 25.
Ibn Chabib. Jacob, 10.
Ibn Ezra, 6, 7; commentaries ascribed to him, which belong to Moses Kimchi, 7; his rendering of Gen. i. 1-3, 70.
Ibn Shemtob, 10.
Ida, Rabbi, 64.
Ika, Rabbi b. Abaja, 48.
Isaac b. Jehudah quotes the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, 24, 25.
—— b. Moses Ha-Levi, see Ephodi.
—— b. Asher, 57.
—— Rabbi, 48, 57.
Ishmael Rabbi, 39, 53, 60, 61, 69.
Itur Sopherim, 42, 48, 49, 67, 68.

J

Jacob b. Chajim, also called Ibn Adonijah, and *Tunisi*, probable date and place of his birth, 1, 2; emigrates from Tunis, 4; becomes connected with Bomberg, edits the Babylonian and the Jerusalem Talmuds, 1, 5, 38; the Hebrew Concordance of Nathan, the Jad Ha-Chezaka of Maimonides, 5; publishes the great Rabbinic Bible, 6; his treatise on the Targum, 9, 12, 13; his name suppressed, 11, 36; embraced Christianity, 11, 13, 14, 36; his death, 14; his description of the state of the Massorah, 19; the relation of his recension of the Massorah to the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, 25-28; his labour connected with the Massorah, 20, 34, 35; refutes Abravanel, 48; his opinion of the origin of the *Keri* and *Kethiv*, 56.
Jarchi, see Rashi.
Jehudah b. Nathan, called *Riban*, 57.
—— b. Bethara, 60.
—— Rabbi, 74.
Jews persecuted in Spain, 2.
Jonathan b. Uzziel, 6.
Joseph the Blind, 7.

K

Kabbalah, the, studied by Christians, 4, 9.
Kahana, Rabbi, 71, 72.
Kennicott, edits a Latin version of Jacob b. Chajim's Introduction, 6.
Keri, the, always followed in reading the Scriptures, 44.
Keri and Kethiv, 40; its origin, 42, 69, 73; number of in each book of the Hebrew Scriptures, 47, 48.
Keri velo Kethiv, 40, 49, 55; number of, 50.
Kethiv velo Keri, 40, 47, 49, 55; number of, 50.
Kimchi, David, 6, 7; quotes the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, 24, 25; his opinion about the origin of the *Keri* and *Kethiv*, 43, 44; refuted, 55.
Kimchi, Moses, author of commentaries ascribed to Ibn Ezra, 7.

L

Lebrecht regards the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* as lost, 25.
Letter, the middle in the Psalms, 15.
Levi b. Gershon, see Ralbag.
Levita calls Jacob b. Chajim Ibn Adonijah, 1; teaches Christians, 4; writes an epilogue to the Rabbinic Bible, 9; praises Ibn Adonijah; loses all his property at the sacking of Rome; goes to Venice, 9; his revision of works, 10; abuses Jacob b. Chajim for embracing Christianity, though he praises his literary works, 11, 23; his opinion about the duration of the Massorites, 15; his description of the state of the Massorah, 19, 20; affirms that the present compilation of the Massorah made by Jacob b. Chajim is chiefly from the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, 23-25, 26-28.
Luzzatto, 10; his declaration that Jacob b. Chajim did embrace Christianity, 11-13.

M

Maharam, see Meier of Rottenburg.
Maimonides, his legal code called *Jad Ha-Chezaka*, 5, 59; his *More Nebuchim*, 52.
Martinez, Fernando, preaches persecution of the Jews, 2.
Massorah, 14; its meaning, 15; origin and import, 15-17; its condition, 7, 8, 19, 41; its utility, 72, &c.
—— finalis, 6, 7, 40, 41, 82, 83.
—— magna, 6, 16, 40; divided into two parts, 32, 83.
—— marginalis, 6, 19, 40, 79, 83.
—— parva, 6, 16, 18, 40.
—— the Great, 24; how treated by the Scribes, 78, 79.
Massorites, their duration, 15, 16.
Massoretic order of the Books in the Bible, 26; treatises, 16, 17, 78.

N

INDEX II.

TOPICS AND NAMES.

A

Abarbanel, see Abravanel.

Abravanel, his opinion about the origin of the *Keri* and *Kethiv*, 44–47, refuted by Jacob b. Chajim, 50–52, 54.

Abja, Rabbi, 63, 71.

Aboth d' Rabbi Nathan, 54.

Achah, Rabbi, 58, 71.

Adelkind, Cornelius, 10.

Ain, the middle letter in the Psalms, 15.

Akiba, Rabbi, 60.

Alashkar, Moses b. Isaac, 2.

Alton, Chajim, 4, 38.

Anthropomorphisms, removed from the text, 68.

Arama, 10.

Aruch, the, 40; different editions of, 41, 49, 51, 67; its definition, *Itur Sopherim*, 67, 82.

B

Ben-Asher, 7.

Ben-Naphtali, 7.

Benjamin of Tudela, 41.

Bereshith, Rabba, see Midrash.

Bible, the Rabbinic, description of, 6, &c., 21, 40.

Bomberg, Daniel, establishes a Hebrew printing office at Venice, 4; his great expenses and work connected with the Rabbinic Bible, 8, 9, 41, 77, 78; engages Levita as corrector of the Hebrew works, 9; his publications, 10; suppresses Jacob b. Chajim's name in consequence of his embracing Christianity, 11, 14; parts with Jacob, 13.

Buxtorf, 35.

C

Cassel, David, 10.

Charles V., 9.

Christians charging the Jews with wilfully altering the text, 42; refutation of the charge, 66–71.

Codices, three, of the Temple, and their readings, 52, 53.

Corecy, Moses de, 10.

Crowns, Book of, 61, 62.

D

Delitzsch, 24.

Derenburg, Dr., 25.

E

Egidio, de Viterbo, Cardinal, befriends Levita, 9.

Elders, 37.

Eliezer, Rabbi, 53.

Ephodi, his view of the origin of the *Keri* and *Kethiv*, 42, 43; refuted, 55.

Ersch and Gruber's Encyklopädie, 10.

Etheridge, Dr., 41.

Euphemisms, substituted for cacophonous expressions, 51, 63.

Ezra, author of the *Keri* and *Kethiv*, 44–47.

F

Ferrer, Vincente, preaches persecution of the Jews, 2.

Ferreras, 3.

Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, 71.

Frensdorff, Dr., 11; his edition of the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, 25, 26; declares that the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* is not the same as that used by Jacob b. Chajim, 27, 28.

Fuerst calls Jacob b. Chajim *Tunisi*, 1; erroneously asserts that Jacob b. Chajim's Introduction was published in English, by Kennicott, 6; his opinion about the date of the edition of Jacob b. Chajim's Treatise on the Targum, 10; his enumeration of Jacob b. Chajim's works, 10, 14; he regards the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* as lost, 25.

G

Gaon, 65.

Geiger, his opinion on the Commentaries ascribed to Ibn Ezra, 7; his description of the Massorah, 15; his charges against Ibn Adonijah of suppressing the materials, 17; refutation of the charges, 18–23; strictures on Frensdorff's remarks on the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, 26; his fixing the date of the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, 34; *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, 49, 53, 69, 70, 71.

Gershon b. Jehodah, 24.

Gerundensis, Moses, see Nachmanides.

Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, 24, 57.

PROVERBS.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
vi.	13	64
xxii.	25	64
xxiii.	35	77
xxvi.	24	64
xxx.	10	64
..	17	34

ECCLESIASTES.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
ii.	11	64
v.	9	54

SONG OF SONGS.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
ii.	11	64
v.	7	77

ISAIAH.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
vii.	2	78
xiii.	16	45, 51, 63
xxx.	33	54
xxxvi.	12	51
xxxvii.	30	65
..	32	50
xlii.	24	34
xlviii.	8	26
li.	16	80
lii.	5	64
lvi.	10	64
lvii.	2	36

JEREMIAH.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i.	5	52
ii.	11	68
..	24	57
iii.	2	45, 51, 63
v.	16	76
xv.	8	64
xvii.	11	64
xxvi.	1	74, 75
xxviii.	1	74, 75
xxxi.	38	40, 49, 50
xxxviii.	16	40, 50
xxxix.	12	40, 50
..	14	26
xlviii.	7	65
l.	29	40, 49, 50
li.	3	40, 50

LAMENTATIONS.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
iii.	19	69
..	39	64

EZEKIEL.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
iii.	12	50
vii.	21	65
viii.	17	68
xvii.	21	64
xxxi.	5	64
xl.	22	64
xl.	26	64
xlvii.	11	64
xlviii.	16	16, 40, 49

DANIEL.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
v.	21	65
xi.	15	65

HOSEA.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
iv.	7	68

OBADIAH.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
..	11	64

HABAKKUK.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i.	12	68
iii.	14	64

ZECHARIAH.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
ii.	12	68
xiv.	2	45, 51

MALACHI.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i.	13	68

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
xxiii.	6	72
xxv.	7	71, 72
xxviii.	27	45, 51, 63
..	30	45, 51
xxxiii.	27	53
xxxiv.	12	5
xxxviii.	30	63

JOSHUA.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
iii.	10	73
vi.	25	79
viii.	11	64
ix.	1	72, 73
x.	17	78
xi.	3	73
xii.	8	73
xvi.	3	64
xxiv.	11	30, 73
..	28	78

JUDGES.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
ii.	6	78
iii.	5	73
..	18	78
ix.	25	78
..	47	78
x.	13	40
xi.	17	72
xv.	5	78
xvi.	31	58
xx.	13	50
xxi.	20	65

RUTH.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
ii.	11	49
..	14	79
..	23	79
iii.	5	40, 49, 50
..	12	40, 49, 50
..	14	64
..	17	40, 49, 50

1 SAMUEL.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i.	9	16, 25
..	23	79
ii.	9	64
..	24	57, 58, 66
iii.	13	68
v.	6	45, 51, 63
..	9	45, 51, 63
..	12	45, 51, 63
vi.	4	45, 51, 63
..	5	45, 51, 63
..	17	63
vii.	9	65
x.	21	64
..	25	78
xi.	7	78
xii.	10	65
xiii.	19	65
xv.	12	78
xviii.	5	64
xix.	19	78
xxi.	14	64
xxiii.	5	64
..	7	78
xxv.	29	11
xxvii.	4	78
xxx.	26	78
xxxi.	4	72

2 SAMUEL.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i.	11	64
ii..	19	79
iii.	21	78
vi.	12	78
viii.	3	40, 49, 50
x.	17	78
xii.	20	64
xiii,	20	79
..	21	50
..	33	40, 50
xv.	31	40
xvi.	12	68
..	21	50
..	23	40, 49
xviii.	2	78
..	20	40, 50
xix.	2	78
xxi.	11	78
xxiv.	14	64
xxx.	33	40

1 KINGS.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i.	1	65
..	51	78
ii.	19	79
..	29	78
..	41	78
ix.	9	65
..	20	73
x.	5	64
xii.	7	65
..	16	68
xvii.	15	54
xviii.	42	64
xxii.	44	67

2 KINGS.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
iv.	34	64
v.	9	64
..	18	40, 49, 50
..	24	78
vi.	13	78
..	25	51
viii.	7	78
x.	27	51
xi.	18	64
xvii.	25	78
..	26	78
xviii.	27	51
xix.	31	40
..	37	40, 50
xx.	18	65
xxii.	5	65
xxiv.	2	78

1 CHRONICLES.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
xix.	17	78
xxv.	1	75
xxix.	16	54

2 CHRONICLES.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
viii.	7	73
x.	16	68
xix.	17	78

EZRA.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
iii.	2	65
iv.	7	64
ix.	1	73

NEHEMIAH.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
ii.	6	51
iii.	30	65
..	31	65
viii.	8	48, 70
ix.	8	73
x.	1–10	37

ESTHER.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
ii.	9	59
ix.	27	65

JOB.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
vii.	20	68
xiv.	5	64
xv.	15	64
xx.	11	64
xxiv.	1	64
xxvi.	14	64
xxix.	19	76
xxxi.	11	54
..	20	64
xxxii.	3	69
xxxvii.	12	64
xxxviii.	41	64
xxxix.	26	64
..	30	64
xl.	17	64

PSALMS.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
v.	10	76
xxiv.	6	64
xxxvi.	7	49, 67
xlv.	10	34
lviii.	8	64
lxviii.	26	49, 67
lxxiii.	16	54
lxxvii.	38	15
lxxx.	14	15
lxxxi.	12	72
cv.	22	64
..	40	64
cvi.	15	78
..	20	68, 69
..	45	64
cxliv.	2	65
cxlvii.	19	64
cxlviii.	2	64

INDEX I.

PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE REFERRED TO.

GENESIS.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i.	1	71, 74, 75
..	1-3	70
..	2	71
..	4	75
..	7	75
..	26	70
..	27	70
ii.	2	70, 71
..	21-23	70
..	22	70
v.	2	71
vi.	7	70
..	9	81
viii.	7	78
..	8	78, 81
..	12	78
xi.	7	70
..	33	81
xii.	1	45
xiv.	2	45, 54
..	8	45
xvii.	19	16
..	27	45
xviii.	5	49, 67
..	12	70, 71
..	22	68
xix.	29	78
xx.	5	54
xxi.	16	79
xxii.	20	78
xxiv.	14	45
..	16	45
..	28	45
..	55	45, 49
..	57	45
xxv.	6	59
..	27	62
xxvii.	19	16
..	29	65
..	42	78
xxxi.	22	78
..	34	79
xxxiii.	4	64
xxxiv.	3	45
..	12	45
xxxviii.	11	79
..	13	78
..	14	79
..	24	78
..	25	54
xliii.	28	65
xlv.	24	78
xlix.	6	70, 71
..	24	79

EXODUS.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
iii.	5	73
..	8	73
..	17	73
iv.	19	53
..	20	70, 71
vi.	11	78
xii.-xxxv.	3	69
..	40	70. 71
..	46	73, 74
xiii.	5	30, 73
..	16	61, 62
xiv.	5	78
xv.	7	69
xviii.	27	78
xix.	22	53
xxiii.	13	67
..	19	15
..	23	73
..	28	73
xxiv.	5	53, 71
..	11	53, 71
xxvii.	11	64
xxix.	29	31
xxxiii.	2	73
xxxiv.	11	73
xxxix.	12	62

LEVITICUS.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i.	1	30
ii.	15	54
x.	16	15
xi.	6	70
..	16	71
..	39	54
..	42	15
xii.	5	15
xiii.	10	54
..	21	54
..	33	15
xiv.	12	31
xv.	10	57
xvi.	31	54
xxi.	9	54
xxiii.	42	74
..	43	74
xxvii.	15	63
..	27	62

NUMBERS.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i.	1	69
v.	13	54
..	14	54
vii.	1	59
xi.	15	68
..	32	64
xii.	3	64
..	12	68
xiii.	29	73
xvi.	15	70, 71
xix.	15	76
xxii.	40	78
xxvii.	11	62, 63
xxix.	19	60
..	31	60
..	33	60
xxxi.	2	49
..	22	72

DEUTERONOMY.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i.	1	50
iv.	19	71
v.	31	49
vi.	4	59
..	8	61, 62
..	9	59
vii.	1	73
x.	10	72
xi.	13	59
..	18	61, 62
..	21	59
..	30	72
xiv.	7	70, 71
xvii.	3	71
xx.	17	73
xxii.	15	45
..	16	45
..	19	45
..	20	45
..	21	45
..	23	45
..	24	45
..	25	45
..	26	45
..	27	45
..	28	45
..	29	45

arrange the Massorah with all the possible improvements, in order that it may remain pure and bright, and show its splendour to the nations and princes; for, indeed, it is beautiful to look at. This was a labour of love for the benefit of our brethren, the children of Israel, and for the glory of our holy and perfect law, as well as to fulfil as far as possible the desire of Don Daniel Bomberg (may his book protect him!), whose expenses in this matter far exceed my labours. And as regards the Commentaries, I have exerted my powers to the utmost degree to correct in them all the mistakes as far as possible; and whatsoever my humble endeavours could accomplish was done for the glory of the Lord, and for the benefit of our people; and I would not be deterred by the enormous labour, for which cause I did not suffer my eyelids to be closed long, either in the winter or summer, and did not mind rising in the cold of the night, as my aim and desire were to see this holy work finished. Now praised be the Creator, who granted me the privilege to begin and to finish this work. Remember me, O my God, for good! Amen.

לעשות ולתקן המסרה בכל התיקונים, שאיפשר כדי להשאירה ברה וטהורה, ולהראות העמים והשרים את יפיה, כי טובת מראה היא, וזה לאוהבי תועלת אחינו בני ישראל, ותפארת תורתינו הקדושה והתמימה ולמלאות תאות ושאלת השר מסי׳ דניאל בומבירגי, ישמרהו צורו, במה שאיפשר אף על פי שכספו היתה גדולה מהשגתי, וכן במפרשים שמתי כל מאמצי כחי לתקן המעוות במה שאפשר, ובמה שהשיגה בו עניות דעתי לשם שמים ולהועיל לבני עמינו, ולא נסוגותי אחור בשביל הטורח הרב, כי שינה לעיני לא נתתי לשובע הן בחורף הן בקיץ, ולא חששתי לקום בלילה לקור, וזולתו כי חפצי וכוונתי היתה לראות תכלית המלאכה מלאכת הקֹדש, ישתבח הבורא, אשר זיכני להתחיל ולהשלים, זכרה לי אלהי לטובה, אמן:

* * *

part it is printed in such and such a prophet, and with what sign. I have also been obliged to repeat and state in the Massorah finalis many of the Massoretic remarks which the former editors have omitted in sundry places, because the page happened to be just as large as was required for printing the other matter. You therefore find it many a time stated in the margin of the Bible [*i. e.*, Massorah marginalis], *the Massorah on this passage is in the Massorah finalis.* Wherever, also, the Massoretic remarks belonging to a certain page were so numerous as to render it impossible to give them in their proper place, which was too narrow, or wherever there were the alphabetical remarks of the Massorah magna which belonged to the same page, I always noted in the margin, "*This is one of such and such an alphabet, and is noted in the Massorah finalis under such and such a letter,*" so that the student may easily find it. And you must not be astonished to find in the Massorah such language as, "It is noted in *second* or *first* Samuel, or *second* Kings, or *second* Chronicles," or to see Ezra and Nehemiah separated; for the author of the Concordance, who divided the law, prophets, and hagiographa into chapters, also divided Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles respectively into two books, and denominated Ezra the first ten chapters of the book, and the rest of the book he called Nehemiah; and as I have adopted the division of the Concordance, I thought it advisable to append to the end of this introduction a list of all the chapters, with the words with which they begin, and of their number in each book; so that if there crept in any mistakes in printing, they may easily be rectified by this list, printed at the end of the Introduction. We have printed in this Bible the number of every chapter, in order that the student may easily find the passage when the Massorah says, "*It is noted in such a chapter.*"

Behold, I have exerted all my might and strength to collate and

מקום נדפס בנביא פלוני, בסימן פלוני, וכן בהרבה מקומות השמיטו המדפיסים הרבה מהסימנים לסיבת שאירע להם להיות העמוד ארוך כדרך שיארע למלאכה הדפוס, הוצרכתי לחזור ולחברם במסרה גדולה, ולכן ימצא הרבה פעמים כתוב סביבות העמוד, נמסר במסרה רבתא: וכן בסימנים הגדולים מל'ט וכ'ה שהיו שייכים לאותו עמוד שלא היה באפשר להדפיסם במקומם, יען היותם ארוכים והעמוד היה קטון מהכיל כל הסימן, וכן באלפא בי'תות המסרה רבתא, שהיו שייכים בעמוד, כתבתי סביב העמוד במסרה זה, הוא חד מן א'ב פלוני, ונמסר במסרה רבתא במערכת אות פלוני, לבל ישיג שום טורח למעיין לבקש; ואין לתמוה כשימצא כתוב במסרה נמסר בשמואל ב', או חלק ב', או א', וכן במלכים ב', וכן בד'ה ב', ובעזרא ג'כ בנחמיה; וזה כי מניח חלוקת פרשיות התורה והנביאים והכתובים הכתוב בקונקורדנסיא חלק שמואל לב' חלקים, וכן מלכים וד'ה ועזרא, עד דברי נחמיה בן חכליה משם ואילך קרא שמו נחמיה: ולזה מאחר שנשתמשנו בחלוקות וסימנים מחבר הקונקורדנסיא, אמרתי לכתוב אחר הקדמתי זאת כל החלוקות והסימנים הללו, שאם בהדפסה נשמט איזה סימן בשגגה, כבר יוכל לתקן מאחר שהם נדפסים אחר הקדמתי זאת, ובכ'ד זה בבל חלוקה וחלוקה הדפסנו הסימן ששייך, למען ירוץ קורא בו, למצוא מבוקשו, כשאומר במסורת נמסר בסימן פלוני:

הנה לא נמנע ממני בכל מאודי וכחי

and in such and such a verse. Had I at that time the Massoretic division of the chapters on the whole Bible I would have preferred it, but I did not get it till I had almost finished the work. I have, nevertheless, published it separately, so that it may not be lost to Israel.

To make the Massorah perfect, I was obliged to rearrange the Massorah magna, for it was impossible to print it in the margin of the Bible, for it is too large; I have therein adopted the alphabetical order of the *Aruch*, to facilitate the reader. Moreover, all that we have printed of the Massorah magna in the margin of the Bible, I have also repeated a second time in the Massorah finalis, which I arranged alphabetically according to the example of the *Aruch*, but did not give it again entire; I have only repeated the beginning of the remarks. Thus, for instance, I said "the word **וישב** occurs fifteen times, as you will find in such and such a prophet and passage;" the same is the case with other observations which I have omitted, and this I have done designedly. Let an illustration suffice. If the student will examine a page of a prophetical or any other book of the Bible, he will find that it has generally ten or eleven verses; that there is not a verse which is without a Massoretic remark on a word or more, and that the Massorah parva notes every word upon which there is any Massorah, and says it occurs four, thirteen, or fifteen times; and that it was impossible to print the whole Massorah which belongs to that page; hence, when there are ten words on it which belongs to the Massorah, I only give four or five at most [in the Massorah marginalis], as the space of the page does not admit of more. Now the student, not knowing whether it is given in another place, or where to look for it, might think that this Bible has not all the Massorah which belongs to it. I have therefore been obliged to indicate in the root of the word in the Massorah magna, in what

וכתבתי נמסר בנביא פלוני, בסימן פלוני, למען ירוץ קורא בו, ואלו הייתי מוצא חלוקת הפרשיות שחלקו בעלי המסרה בכל המקרא, חייתי יותר הפץ להשתמש ממנה מזולתה, ואחר כך הניעה לידי לאחר שכבר כמעט השלמתי, אמרתי להרפיסה נם היא, לבל תשתכח ותאבד מישראל:

וכדי שיהיה המסורת שלם, הוצרכתי לתקן ולחבר אחר כך המסורת הגדולה, שאין באפשרות להרפיסה סביב שום ספר, כי היא בכמותה הרבה, וסדרתיה כדרך הערוך ממש, למען ירוץ קורא בה: ובן כל מה שהדפסנו מהמסרה סביב העשרים וארבע דהיינו מהמסר' האמצעית, לא הגדולה הזרתי והברתי אותה עם המסרה הגדולה שסדרתי כמו הערוך, ולא חשתי לחביא כי אם ראשי פרקים, כגון וישב ט׳ו נמסר בנביא פלוני בסימן פלוני, וכן כל מה שנשמט וזה לסבה; המשל אם המעיין יעיין בנביא או זולתו, באותו העמוד יש י׳ או י׳א פסוקים, בכל פסוק לא ימנע שלא תהיה בו תיבה ששייך בה מסורת, והמסרה קטנה היא בכל תיבה ששייך בה מסורת, ואומרת ד׳ או ל׳, או ט׳ו, וזה לא היה באפשר לכתוב המסורת כולו שהיה שייך לאותו דף, שאם היו שייכים י׳ תיבות למסורת, הבאתי מהם ד׳ או ה׳ על הרוב, לדוחק רוחב העמוד, והמעיין לא ידע אם הם במקום אחד כבר נדפם, ובאיזה מקום הם כדי לבקשם במקומם, ויחשוב בלבו שאין כעשרים וארבע זה כל המסורת ששייך בו, לכן הוצרכתי לציין בשרש התיבה ההיא במסרה רבתא, באיזה

מסיג או זוכר לידע, כי אם תיבה אחת שהיא פועל או שם מהפסוק, תכף תמצא מבוקשך בשרש הפועל, או השם ההוא; וגדולה מעלת ותועלת זה הספר לאין תכלית, וזולתו ובלעדו אין דרך לעיין במסורת למצוא הפסוק שצריך תכף, כי צריך שהמעיין יבקש הפסוק שמביא המסורת או זולתו שצריך, יעבור זמן רב כי יבאו פסוקים שלא ידע באיזה נביא הם, ואפילו ידעו צריך שיבקש כל הנביא, ולאו כל עלמא מקרא גמירי, ומי שהגיע ספר זה לידו, אין צריך לו לשרשי הקמחי, כי יש בו השרשים מוסף עליו המורה מקום מכל פסוקי המקרא, לא יחסר עד אחד; סוף דבר בלעדיו לא הייתי יכול לעשות מה שעשיתי:

ובהיות כי המסורת היה רב לחדפיסו כלו סביב המקרא במקום שכבר הבאתי סימן א׳, פעם א׳, לא חשתי להביאו פעם אחרת, דמיון זה וישלח הם כ׳ב, כתבתי אותם כולם פעם אחת בסדר נח בפסוק וישלח את היונה, כשהגעתי אחר כך בוישלח אחר, לא רציתי להאריך לכתבו פעם אחרת, כי כבר נכתב ונחתם, אבל כתבתי הוא נמסר בסדר נח; ובנביאים בהיות שהם גדולים וכל נביא יש בו בכמותו בכמו כ׳ה פעם, שיש בכל פרשה ופרשה, אם הייתי כותב נמסר בנביא פלוני לבד, היה יוצא שכרי בהפסדי, שלא היה באפשרות למצוא כי אם בקושי גדול, והיה המעיין קץ בו, והיה מניחו מלבקשו, לכן הוצרכתי להשתמש בחלוקת הפרשיות, שהביא בספרו רבי יצחק נתן ספר הקונקורדנצייא,

verse, whether verb or noun, you will easily find the required passage under the root of the verb or noun. The advantage to be derived from this book is indescribable; without it there is no way of examining the references of the Massorah, since one who studies the Massorah must look into the verse which the Massorah quotes, and which without a concordance would take a very long time to find, as you might not know in which prophet the passage referred to occurs, and if you knew the prophet, you might still not know the chapter and verse. Besides, all the world is not so learned in the Scriptures. Whosoever has this concordance does not require any more the lexicon of Kimchi, for it contains all the roots, whereunto is added an index of all the verses in the Bible: none of them is wanted. In conclusion, without it I could not have done the work which I have done.

Seeing that the Massorah was too large to be printed entire in the margin, I have not repeated the Massoretic remark after it has been given once. Thus, for instance, וישלח, *and he sent*, occurs twenty-two times: I enumerated the passages in the remark on the words וישלח [Gen. viii. 8], and when I afterwards came again to the word וישלח, in another place, I did not repeat all these references, having given them once before, but simply said the Massoretic remark will be found in section Noah.[73] As the prophetic books are large, every prophet having on an average twenty-five chapters, my labour would have been in vain if I had simply said the word is found in such and such a prophet, since the reference could not be found without great exertion, and the student would soon have grown weary and left it off altogether. I have therefore adopted the division of the chapters which R. Isaac Nathan made, and said it occurs in such and such a prophet, guage of the Massorah; and whenever I took exception to the statement of a certain Codex of the Massorah, because its remark did not harmonise with the majority of the copies of the Massorah, whilst the same difficulty was not found in the others, or whenever it contradicted itself, or where there was a mistake, I made a careful search till I discovered the truth, according to my humble knowledge; but sometimes I had to leave it in uncertainty, and for this reason there will be found many such in the margin of the Bible which we printed. The Lord alone knows how much labour I bestowed thereon, as those will testify who saw me working at it. As to the revision of the verses, it would have been impossible for me to do it correctly without knowing the whole Scriptures by heart, and this is far from me. But for a certain book called *Concordance*, the author of which is the learned R. Isaac Nathan,[72] who lived some forty years ago, published in our printing-office at Venice, I could not have corrected the verses. This is a precious work; it embraces all the points of the Holy Bible, and explains all the sacred Scriptures, by stating all nouns and verbs with their analogous forms, and giving at the heading of every noun and verb an explanation, saying the meaning of the word is so and so, and branches out in such and such a manner, and comments upon each one separately. It also marks the division of each chapter, and the number of chapters in every prophetical book, and tells in which chapter and verse every word occurs, *i. e.*, verse 4, 20, or 30, thereby any word wanted may easily be found. And if a verse has four or five verbs or nouns, *e. g.*, וּבְצֵל יָדִי כִּסִּיתִךָ, *in the shadow of mine hand* [Isa. li. 16], you will find it quoted under צֵל, *shadow;* under יָד, *hand;* and under כָּסָה, *to cover;* so that if you only remember one word in the

---

[73] נח is the title of one of the Sabbatic lessons, comprising Gen. vi. 9–xi. 33; *vide supra*, p. 8, § xiv., note 12.

במסורת נקוד על הפלוגתא, בהיות כי אינו מלשון בעל המסורת; וכן במקומות שהיה קשה לי על לשון ספר אחד מהמסרה, שלא הייתי מוצא כדבריו ברוב הספרים, ובמסרה אחרת באופן אחר ולא היה קשה, ובמקומות שהיה קשה מדידיה אדידיה, או שהיה טעות, הייתי חוקר עד שהייתי מוצא האמת לעניות דעתי, ובמקומות הנחתי הדבר בספק, וכן כמה מיני קהוון, כאשר ימצא כתוב סביבות עשרים וארבע זה שהדפסנו; והשם יודע כמה טורח עבדתי על זה, וכבר זה מפורסם לכל מי שראה אותי מתעסק בו: ובהגהת הפסוקים לא היה איפשר שהייתי יכול להגיה אלא אם כן שהייתי יודע כל העשרים וארבע על פה, זה נעלם ממני, ואלולי ספר אחד הנקרא שמו קונקורדנסייא, חבדו הכם אחד קרוב לזמנינו זה בכמו ארבעים שנה, שמו רבי יצחק נתן, זכר צדיק לברכה,[72] שכבר נדפס פה ויניציא בבית דפוסינו, לא היה באפשר שהייתי יכול להגיה, והוא כלי יקר, מקיף כל קטרי המכתב הקדוש, ומבאר כל המכתב הקדוש בחברו כל שם ופועל עם הדומה לו, ובראש כל שם ופועל מפרש התיבה הזאת פירש כך וכך, או תפרד לכך וכך ראשים, ופירשם כך וכך, ובציינו אותם הציונים בחלוקת כל פרשה ופרשה, וכל נביא ונביא, לכך וכך פרשיות, ובכל תיבה רושם זאת תמצא בסימן פלוני, בפסוק ד׳, או כ׳, או ל׳, שבסבת זה תכף בנקלה ימצא המבוקש; ואם פסוק אחד יש לו ד׳, או ה׳ פעלים ושמות, כגון ובצל ידי כסיתיך, תמצא פסוק זה בשרש צל, ובשרש יד, ובשרש כסה, עד שאם אינך

---

[72] For R. Isaac Nathan, see Kitto's *Cyclopædia, s. v.*

then *the fifth* verse, "the word וַתֵּשֶׁב occurs fifteen times,"[69] without any order or plan. Moreover, most of these [Massoretic remarks] are written in a contracted form and with ornaments, so much so that they cannot at all be deciphered, as the desire of the writer was only to embellish his writing, and not to examine or to understand the sense. Thus, for instance, in most of the copies there are four lines [of the Massorah] on the top of the page, and five at the bottom, as the writer would under no circumstances diminish or increase the number. Hence, whenever there happened to be any of the alphabetical lists,[70] or if the Massoretic remarks were lengthy, he split them up in the middle, or at the beginning, and largely introduced abbreviations, so as to obtain even lines. Now, when I observed all this confusion, I bestirred myself in the first place to arrange all the Massoretic notes according to the verses to which they belonged, and then to investigate the Massoretic treatises in my possession, apart from what is written in the margin of the Bibles. Whenever an omission or contraction occurred [in those copies of the Bible which had the Massorah] in order to obtain even lines, or four lines [of Massorah] at the top [of a page in the Bible] and five at the bottom, I at once consulted the Massoretic treatises, and corrected it according to order. And whenever I found that the Massoretic treatises differed from each other, I put down the opinions of both sides, as will be found in the margin of our edition of the Bible published by us, with the Massorah,[71] the word in dispute being marked to indicate that it is not the lan-

ט׳ו,[69] בלי סדר ותיקון, ורובם היו כתובים בקשרים וציורים, עד שלא היה באפשרות להבין מחן שום דבר, כי כוונת הסופר היתה ליפות כתיבתו ולא לחבין ולעיין בה; וגם ברובם במשל היו בראש הדף כמו ארבע שורות ולמטה כמו חמש, לעולם הסופר לא היה מוסיף ולא גורע, ואם אירע א׳ב או לשון מסורת גדול,[70] היה מפסיק באמצע או בראש, וכן מקצר מהם הרבה כדי להשוות שורותיו; וכשראיתי כל זה הבלבול, נערתי חצני, בתחלה לשים כל המסורת על סדר הפסוקים, ואח׳כ הפשתי בספרי המסרה שהיו לי חבורים לבד זולת מה שהיה כתוב סביב המקרא, ובמקומות שהיה הדלוג מהסופר והקצור כדי להשוות השורות, שיהיו במספר ד׳ למעלה וה׳ לטטה, אז הייתי מבקש בחבורי המסרה, והייתי מתקנם על נכון, ובמקומות שמצאתי הפרש בין ספרי המסרה זה אומר בכה וזה אומר בכה, הבאתי דעות שניהם, וכן ימצא כתוב סביבות המקרא הזאת[71] שהדפסנו

---

[69] The instances in which וַתֵּשֶׁב occurs, are as follows: Gen. xxi. 16 (twice); xxxi. 34; xxxviii. 11, 14; xlix. 24: Josh. vi. 25: 1 Sam. i. 23: 2 Sam. xiii. 20: 1 Kings ii. 19: Ruth ii. 23, 14. They are enumerated in the Massorah marginalis, on Gen. xxxviii. 11, and on 2 Sam. xiii. 20, where it is distinctly stated that there are only twelve instances; and indeed there are no more to be found in the Hebrew Scriptures. The statement, therefore, in the text, that there are *fifteen* such instances, which is to be found in all the editions of Jacob b. Chajim's Introduction, must be a slip of the pen.

[70] By Alphabetic Massorah is meant, a certain number of exceptions, or peculiar forms of words, which come under the same rubric, and are arranged and enumerated in alphabetical order.

[71] Hence the Massorah thus put in the margin obtained the name *Massorah marginalis*.

upon he did all in his power to send into all the countries in order to search what may be found of the Massorah; and, praised be the Lord, we obtained as many of the Massoretic books as could possibly be got. The said gentleman was not backward, and his hand was not closed, nor did he draw back his right hand from producing gold out of his purse to defray the expenses of the books, and of the messengers who were engaged to make search for them in the most remote corners, and in every place where they might possibly be found.

And when I examined these Massoretic books, and mastered their contents, I found them in the utmost disorder and confusion, so much so that there was not a sentence to be found without a blunder, that is to say, the quotations from the Massorites are both incorrect and misplaced; since in those copies [of the Bible] in which the Massorah is written in the margin, it is not arranged according to the order of the verses contained in the page. Thus, for instance, if a page has five or six verses, the first of which begins with וַיֹּאמֶר, *and he said*, the second with וַיֻּגַּד, *and it was told*, the third with וְזֶה, *and this*, the fourth with וַיְשַׁלַּח, *and he sent*, the fifth with וַתֵּשֶׁב, *and she sat*, the Massorah begins with וַיְשַׁלַּח, *the fourth* verse, "the word וַיְשַׁלַּח occurs twenty-two times;"[67] then follows verse two, "the word וַיֻּגַּד occurs twenty-four times;"[68] and

מאמצי כחו לשלוח בכל אלו הגלילות, לחפש כל מה שימצא מהמסרה, ותהלה לאל נתגלגלו לידינו מספרי המסרה מה שאיפשר לחתגלגל, והשר הנזכר לא נתעצל, וידו לא קפץ, וימינו לא השיב אחור, מלהזיל זהב מכיסו בהוצאת קניית הספרים, והשלוחים אשר נשתדלו לחפשם בחורים ובסדקים ובכל מקום שהיו:

ואחר שראיתי בספרי המסרה והתבוננתי בהם, ראיתים מבולבלים בתכלית, ומשובשים עד שאין בהם בית אשר אין שם מת, היינו הפסוקים שהיה מביא בעל המסורת והבלבול הגדול שהיה בהם, כי אותם הספרים שהיה בהם המסרה סביב, לא היתה המסרה כתובה כסדר הפסוקים שהיה בעמוד, דמיון זה אם היו חמשה או ששה פסוקים בעמוד, האחר מהתיל ויאמר, והשני ויגד, והשלישי וזה, והרביעי וישלח, והחמישי ותשב, המסורת היה מתחיל וישלח כ׳ב,[67] ואחר כך ויגד כ׳ד,[68] ואחר כך ותשב

---

[67] The instances in which וַיְשַׁלַּח is the *Piel*, future, with *Vav* conversive, are the following: Gen. viii. 7, 8, 12; xix. 29; xlv. 24: Exod. xviii. 27: Numb. xxii. 40: Josh. xxiv. 28: Judges ii. 6; iii. 18; xv. 5: 1 Sam. x. 25; xi. 7; xxx. 26: 2 Sam. iii. 21; xviii. 2: 2 Kings v. 24; xvii. 25, 26; xxiv. 2: Psalm cvi. 15. In the Massorah marginalis on Gen. viii. 7, where the instances are enumerated, twenty-one only are given, and there are no more to be found in the Bible, though the Massorah, like Ibn Adonijah, states that there are twenty-two, unless we include in this rubric וִישַׁלַּח (Exod. vi. 11), with *Vav* conjunctive. It is moreover to be added, that there is evidently a misprint in the Massorah, where we have וישלח לוט, a second time instead of וישלח את היונה (Gen. viii. 12).

[68] The twenty-four instances in which וַיֻּגַּד, *Hophal*, future, with *Vav* conversive, are as follows: Gen. xxii. 20; xxvii. 42; xxxi. 22; xxxviii. 13, 24: Exod. xiv. 5: Josh. x. 17: Judges ix. 25, 47: 1 Sam. xv. 12; xix. 19; xxiii. 7; xxvii. 4: 2 Sam. vi. 12; x. 17: 1 Chron. xix. 17: 2 Sam. xix. 2; xxi. 11: 1 Kings i. 51; ii. 29, 41: 2 Kings vi. 13; viii. 7: Isaiah vii. 2. They are enumerated in the Massorah finalis, under the letter *He*, p. 22 *b*, col. 4.

Theological Decisions of Maharam,[66] where the latter defines what is meant by the word הִכּוּנִי, *he smote me*, which the Massorah says occurs twice, viz., Song of Songs v. 7, Proverbs xxiii. 35 (by a comparison of these two passages), *vide in loco*. In fact, there can be no doubt that whenever the Massorites state an expression occurs 7 or 4 or 10 or 3 times, they are designed for some great purpose, and are not useless. All this shews the great sanctity of our holy law, and that the parallels are marked with a design. Moreover, when the Massorah makes the remark in Chaldee, there is a reason for it, which will be found upon examination. For this reason I have collected all that I could find of their remarks in the Massoretic books which I possess, collated it, and put it in these twenty-four sacred books, arranging everything in its proper place, and I have repeated it again in the Massorah finalis, so that it can easily be found. Were I inclined to write more largely upon this subject, and to show the use of all the Massorah, and support it by proofs, it would occupy too much space, and the perusal of it would be a weariness to the flesh.

מהר'ם,[66] כדפסק בהכוני שהם שנים, הכוני פצעוני, הכוני בל חליתי, עיין שם: ואין ספק כי מנין הסימנים להיותם שבעה, או ארבעה, או עשרה, או שלשה, כולם לצורך גדול ולא לחנם, וזה מוכיח על קדושת תורתינו הקדושה, ולא לחנם נסמנו; וכן כשהמסרה מביאה הסימן בלשון תרגום, יש בו לדרוש ולהבין, ולכן כל מה שיכולתי למצוא וללקט מהם מכל ספרי המסרה שהיו לי, כולם לקטתי ושמתים בעשרים וארבע זה, במקומות שהיו שייכים, וחזרתי ותקנתים במסרה הגרולה, כדי שבנקלה ימצאו; ואלו הייתי רוצה להאריך ולהביא תועלות המסרה כולן וראיותיהם, היה חאורך גדול, ולהג הרבה יגיעת בשר:

ובחיות כי ראיתי התועלת הגדול הנמשך מהמסרה גדולה וקטנה, ומסרה רבתא, גליתי אזן חשר דניאל בומבירגי ישמרהו צורו וגאלו, והודעתיו התועלת שימשך ממנה, אז שם כל

When I saw the great benefit which is to be derived from the Massorah magna, the Massorah parva, and the Massorah finalis, I apprised Seignior Daniel Bomberg of it, may his Rock and Redeemer protect him! and shewed him the advantage of the Massorah. Where-

---

Mordecai has been printed with the *Sepher Ha-Halachoth*, Constantinople, 1509; Venice, 1521–22; Sabionetta, 1524, &c. It has also appeared separately, Venice, 1558; Cracow, 1598, &c. Compare Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, ii., 324, &c.; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, 1659, &c. The work derives its appellation from the author, whose name was Mordecai b. Hillel, and who was martyred at Nürnberg, 1310.

[66] מה״רם, *Maharam*, is the acrostic of מורנו הרב מאיר, *our teacher the Rabbi Meier*. This R. Meier b. Baruch, who was born 1230, and died 1293, was one of the most distinguished Jewish literati during the middle ages, and the first official chief Rabbi in the German empire, to which dignity he was nominated by the Emperor Rodolph I., of Hapsburg. He had his seat and college at Rottenburg-an-der-Tauber, whence he is also called Meier of Rottenburg, or Meier Rottenburg. His *Theological Decisions*, or *Questions and Answers* (שאלות ותשובות), have been published at Cremona, 1557; Prague, 1603. He also wrote *Commentaries on the Massorah* (באורי מסרת), which are still in MS. in the public libraries. Compare Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, iii., 176, &c., Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vol. vii., p. 183, &c.; Leipzig, 1863.

המעשה, בכלל בין קדש לחול, ואומרים אותו כדי לסמוך לחתימה מעין חתימה,[63] ותו גרסינן במסורת פתוח ד׳, וסימנו וכל כלי פתוח, שרשי פתוח אלי מים, קבר פתוח גרונם, אשפתו כקבר פתוח, ואינון כנגד ארבע מדות שהם בכלי חרס, נקב בכונס משקה, נפסל מלקדש בו מי הטאת, היינו וכל כלי פתוח וגומר, ועדיין כלי הוא לזרעים, נקב בשורש קטן, טהור הוא לזרעים, אם היה בעציץ נקוב אינו מקבל טומאה, היינו שרשי פתוח דאיוב, ועדיין כלי הוא לקבל בו זיתים, נקב במוציא זית, טהור העשוי לאוכלין, היינו קבר פתוח גרונם דתלים, דסתם אכילה כזית, ועדיין כלי הוא לרמונים, נקב במוציא רמון, טהור הוא לגמרי, והיינו אשפתו פתוח, כלומר כשהכלי במוציא רמון, נדמה לאשפה דשוב אין תורת כלי עליו;[64] והרבה מסימנים אלו נדרשים בכהאי גוונא לאין מספר, ומהם מפוזרים במרדכי,[65] ובתשובות

the six days of creation,'' is included in "between holy and profane,'' and is simply repeated in order to make it agree in sense with the concluding benediction[63] [*Pessachim*, 103 *b*, 104 *a*]. Again we read in the Massorah, "פָּתוּחַ, *opened*, occurs four times, and the passages are Numb. xix. 15, Job xxix. 19, Psalm v. 10, and Jerem. v. 16;'' and these four correspond to the four laws which obtain with regard to an earthen vessel, viz., when it has a hole through which the water runs into it, the law is that it must not be used for consecrating therein the water of sin-offering, thus answering to "and every open vessel'' [Numb. xix. 15]; yet it is still a vessel with respect to the growing of plants. But if the hole is so large that a small root can be put through it, then it is clean for growing therein plants, for when a plant grows in a vessel which has a hole, it is no longer subject to defilement, thus answering to "my root is opened'' [Job xxix. 19]; yet it is still a vessel with respect to olives. If the hole, however, is so large that an olive can pass through it, then it is clean [or not subject to defilement], thus answering to "an open sepulchre is their throat'' [Ps. v. 10], for what amounts to eating is the size of an olive; yet it is still a vessel with respect to pomegranates. But if the hole is so large that a pomegranate can pass through it, then it is no longer subject to any defilement, and thus answers to "his heap is as an open sepulchre'' [Jerem. v. 16]; that is to say, when the vessel has a hole through which a pomegranate can pass, it is like a heap of rubbish, for it is no longer regarded as a vessel.[64] Many of the Massoretic signs are used for such explanations in innumerable cases; some of them are dispersed through *the book Mordecai*,[65] and in the

[63] חתימה is the reading of the first, second, and third editions of the Rabbinic Bibles, in accordance with the Talmud (*Pessachim*, 103 *a*), whence it is quoted. Later editions have erroneously פתיחה.

[64] Things in a vessel are, according to the Talmud, subject to defilement. If the vessel, however, happens to have a hole, then it all depends upon the size of this hole, the definition of which is the subject of discussion. Compare Maimonides, *Iad Ha-Chesaka*, *Hilchoth Kelim*, section xiv., vol. iii., p. 350; ed. Amsterdam, 1702.

[65] מרדכי, *Mordecai*, also called ספר המרדכי, *the Book of Mordecai*, is a treatise on the Legal Code (ספר ההלכות), embodying all the laws of the Talmud, which was compiled, revised, corrected, annotated, and supplemented by Isaac Alphasi. This *Sepher*

בדורו נתישבה דעתו, בקש הקב׳ה להחזיר את העולם לתהו ובוהו מבני דורו של צדקיהו, כיון שנסתכל בצדקיהו נתישבה דעתו, עד כאן;[59] ותו גרסינן במסורת ויבדל ג׳, ויבדל אלהים בין האור, ויבדל בין המים, ויבדל דוד ושרי הצבא בדברי הימים כ״ה,[60] כדאמר בערבי פסחים כל הפוחת לא יפחות משלשה הבדלות,[61] ולא יוסיף על שבע, בשלמה אין מוסיפין על שבע, דהתם קא חשיב שבע הבדלות ולא אשכחן טפי, אלא שלשה אמאי, משום דשלש פעמים כתיב ויבדל, והבדלה ראשונה היתה במוצאי שברת, לפיכך עושים שלשה הבדלות במוצאי שבת, בין קדש לחול, בין אור לחשך בין ישראל לגוים,[62] ובין יום השביעי לששת ימי

time, His mind was appeased: God again wanted to reduce the world to void and emptiness, because of the people of Zedekiah's time, but when He looked upon Zedekiah, His mind was appeased" [*Erachin*, 17 *a*].[59] Again we read in the Massorah, "וַיַּבְדֵּל, *and he separated*, occurs three times, viz., Gen. i. 4, 7; 1 Chron. xxv. 1."[60] Now it is said in the Talmud, "Whoso [in the *Havdalah*][61] mentions the separations [of God] must not mention less than three, nor more than seven. [Query.] To say not more than seven is right, because seven separations are instanced, and there are no more; but why should there be not less than three? [Reply]. Because וַיַּבְדֵּל occurs three times; and as the first separation was between the Sabbath and the week days, therefore must the three separations be mentioned at the close of the Sabbath, viz., "between holy and profane," "between light and darkness," and "between Israel and the Gentiles;"[62] the fourth separation which is mentioned on this occasion, viz., "between the seventh day and

[59] The Massoretic enumeration of these three passages suggests an explanation of the passage in the Talmud, where Jer. xxvi. 1 and xxviii. 1, are connected with Gen. i. 1, shewing that God wished, in those cases where בראשית is used, to destroy the work of the first בראשית. May not this striking illustration also suggest the design of the Massorah in its first origin?

[60] The *editio princeps* differs from the succeeding editions in the quotations. Thus, for instance, the first, second, and third editions of Jacob. b. Chajim's Bible indicate the reference to Genesis i. 7, by quoting simply ויבדל בן המים, whereas the later editions add אשר מתחת לרקיע; whilst the third reference in the *editio princeps* is to ויבדל אהרן קדש קדשים, which does not occur in the Hebrew Scriptures, and has therefore rightly been altered in the second, third, and the other editions into ויבדל דוד ושרי הצבא בד״ה כ״ה.

[61] *Havdalah* הבדלה is the name of the prayer which the Jews to this day offer on Sabbath evening, at the going out of the Sabbath and coming in of the week day. The last benediction in this prayer, in which occur the passages referred to in the Talmud, is as follows: ברוך אתה יי אלהינו מלך העולם המבדיל בין קדש לחול בין אור לחשך בין ישראל לעמים בין יום השביעי לששת ימי המעשה ׳ברוך אתה יי המבדיל בין קדש לחול *Blessed be the Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast made a distinction between the holy and the common, between light and darkness, between Israel and the other nations, between the seventh day and the other six days of work; blessed be thou, O God, who hast made a distinction between the holy and the common!*

[62] This is the reading of the *editio princeps*, as well as of the second and third editions, of the Rabbinic Bibles; later editions have substituted לעמים for לגוים, because of the fear of Christians, who took it to refer to themselves.

[Exod. xii. 46];[57] and the similar case in connection with the feast of tabernacles, where we have בַּסֻּכֹּת בַּסֻּכֹּת בַּסֻּכּוֹת [*Succa*, 6 *b*];[58] and many other examples might be adduced on this subject (*vide* Tossafoth on *Succa*). This also obtains by the marginal readings which are not in the text, the *Kametz* and *Pattach*, and other things of a similar kind, which alter the sense, and of which there are numerous examples. Again, also, in the point of the numbers of passages which the Massorah gives, saying, "There are three or four more," &c.; from all this we learn many different laws and explanations. Thus, for instance, when it is said in the Massorah on the word בְּרֵאשִׁית, *in the beginning*, that it begins the verse three times, viz., Gen. i. 1; Jerem. xxvi. 1, xxviii. 1; it throws light upon what is said in the Talmud, where it is declared "God wanted to reduce the world again to void and emptiness, because of the wicked Jehojakim, but when He looked upon the people of his

יאכל,[57] ודכוותיה בפרק קמא דסוכה סוכות סוכת,[58] ואיכא לקהויי ולאקושי טובא בהא ועיין בתוספת פרק קמא דסוכה; והוא הדין בקריין ולא כתיבין, וקמצין ופתחין, והמקומות שהם משתנין בטעמא, ודכוותיה טובא לאין מספר; ותו ג׳כ במניינא, דמני המסורת באמרו ג׳ או ד׳ או זולתו, מכולהו ילפינן כמה וכמה דינין ודרשות, כהא דאמרינן במסורת בראשית ג׳ ר׳פ וסימן בראשית ברא, בראשית ממלכות יהויקים, בראשית ממלכת צדקיה, היינו דאמרינן במסכת ערכין ס׳פ יש בערכין, בקש הקב׳ה להחזיר את העולם לתוהו ובהו בשביל יהויקים, כיון שנסתכל

---

[57] As *the Kethiv* is יֵאָכֵל *passive*, and *the Keri* יֹאכַל *active*, two inferences are deduced therefrom in the Talmud. R. Jehudah maintains that the man who partakes of the passover, HE must eat it (יֹאכַל) in one place (בבית אחד), but that the passover itself may be divided, and a part of it may be eaten by another company in another place; basing his argument upon *the Keri* יֹאכַל *he must eat it at one place*. Whereas R. Simeon maintains that the passover itself IT must be eaten (יֵאָכֵל) in one place (בבית אחד), and cannot be divided between two different companies in different places, though the man himself, after having eaten his passover at home, may go to another place and partake of another company's passover; basing his argument upon *the Kethiv* יֵאָכֵל *it must be eaten in one place*.

[58] The word בסכות occurs three times in the Pentateuch (twice in Lev. xxiii. 42, and once in ver. 43); in two cases (Lev. xxiii. 42) it is defective, *i. e.*, without the ו, and in the third instance it is plene, *i. e.*, with the ו. Now, upon the saying of the Rabbins that a tabernacle must have two whole walls, and the third may be a partial one, to be a legal tabernacle, R. Simeon remarks that it must have *three* entire walls, and that the fourth may be a partial one, to constitute it a tabernacle according to the law. This difference of opinion the Talmud explains by saying that the sages follow the spelling בסכת, בסכת, בסכות, which makes *four* (since two are in the singular and one in the plural); one of these four represents the commandment itself, shewing that we must have a סכה, and the remaining three indicate the three walls, one of which is allowed by the Halacha to be partial. Whereas R. Simeon follows the pronunciation, which is alike plural in all the three instances, and hence obtains *six*. He then takes one of these three (*i. e.*, of the plurals) to indicate the commandment respecting the feast itself, and the remaining two plurals, being four in number, he refers to the four walls of the סכה, one of which may, according to the Halacha, be partial,

the passage, "*and it came to pass, when all the kings heard*" [wherewith the verse in Joshua ix. 1 begins]. From this you can see the beautiful and laconic style of the Massorites, for thereby they make known to us how the passage is to be read and written. If it had not been for the Massorites, how could we tell, when we find it written, *the Hittites*, AND *the Amorites*, AND *the Canaanites*, AND *the Perizzites*, whether the order is right or wrong?[56] The same is the case with *plene* and *defective*, since with us the *Keri* and *Kethiv* are of paramount importance, although there is a dispute as to which of them should be made the basis [in expounding the text]; *e. g.*, in *Pessachim*, 16 *b*, where the question is about the word יאכל

ופירש דהבא אך את הזהב למלכיא ויהי כשמוע כל המלכים, הנך רואה צחות לשון בעל המסורת וקוצר לשונו, ובזה הודיענו כיצד קריאת וכתיבת הפסוק, ואלולי בעל המסורת היכא הוינן ידעין אם הוה מצינן כתוב החתי והאמורי והכנעני והפריזי, לא הוינן ידעין להוכחא אם אמת או שקר,[56] וכן במלאים והסרים, דיש לנו אם למקרא ואם למסורות, ומיהו פלוגתא היא ממה עבדינן עיקר, כגון בפרק כיצד צולין גבי בבית אחר

---

[56] To understand the remark in the text, it is necessary to add to what we have already said upon this subject (*vide supra*, p. 30, &c.), that Ibn Adonijah alludes to those six verses out of the twenty, containing the names of the Canaanitish nations, which are divisible into two groups, of three verses each (ב' זוגין מן ג'), and which with the other fourteen form one rubric. They are as follows:—

Exod. iii. 8	הכנעני והחתי והאמרי והפרזי והחוי והיבוסי
Exod. iii. 17	הכנעני והחתי והאמרי והפרזי והחוי והיבוסי
Judges iii. 5	הכנעני החתי והאמרי והפרזי והחוי והיבוסי
Deut. xx. 17	החתי והאמרי הכנעני והפרזי החוי והיבוסי
Joshua ix. 1	החתי והאמרי הכנעני הפרזי החוי והיבוסי
Joshua xii. 8	החתי האמרי והכנעני הפרזי החוי והיבוסי

These are the only six instances out of the twenty passages which follow in definite order; of the other fourteen, there are not only some which do not give all the names, but each has an arbitrary sequence in the enumeration. They are as follows:—

Exod. xiii. 5	הכנעני והחתי והאמרי והחוי והיבוסי
Exod. xxiii. 23	האמרי והחתי והפרזי והכנעני החוי והיבוסי
Exod. xxiii. 28	את החוי את הכנעני ואת החתי
Exod. xxxiii. 2	את הכנעני האמרי והחתי והפרזי החוי והיבוסי
Exod. xxxiv. 11	את האמרי והכנעני והחתי והפרזי והחוי והיבוסי
Numb. xiii. 29	והחתי והיבוסי והאמרי . . . והכנעני
Deut. vii. 1	החתי והגרגשי והאמרי והכנעני והפרזי והחוי והיבוסי
Josh. iii. 10	את הכנעני ואת החתי ואת החוי ואת הפרזי ואת הגרגשי והאמרי והיבוסי
Josh. xi. 3	הכנעני והאמרי והחתי והפרזי והיבוסי והחוי
Josh. xxiv. 11	האמרי והפרזי והכנעני והחתי והגרגשי החוי והיבוסי
1 Kings ix. 20	האמרי החתי הפרזי החוי והיבוסי
Ezra ix. 1.	לכנעני החוי הפרזי היבוסי והאמרי
Nehem. ix. 8	הכנעני החתי האמרי והפרזי והיבוסי והגרגשי
2 Chron. viii. 7	החתי והאמרי והפרזי והחוי והיבוסי,

It will be seen that even in those instances where the order is the same, the use of the *Vav* conjunctive is so arbitrary, that were it not for the Massorah, which most minutely marks both its presence and absence; it would be very difficult to ascertain the correct orthography.

this subject? R. Kahana answered him, In this case Rabe himself yields."[55] Thus far.

Tossafoth remarks thereupon, and this is its language, "In the correct Codices it is לֹא without the *Vav*, and this is also evident from the Massorah [which says], 'לֹא occurs three times, in conjunction with אָבָה, viz., Deut. x. 10, xxv. 7, and Ps. lxxxi. 12; and in two other passages it commences the verse, and is with *Vav* conjunctive, viz., Deut. xi. 30. and xxiii. 6.' It also occurs in two other passages of the same kind, not mentioned in the Massorah, viz., 1 Sam. xxxi. 4, and Judges xi. 17." Thus far the language of Tossafoth. You can see now that if it had not been for the Massorah we should not have known whether to read לֹא, *not*, or וְלֹא, *and not* [in Deut. xxv. 7]. But finding in the Massorah that לֹא אָבָה occurs three times, and that the passage in question is counted among them, it is evident that the reading was not וְלֹא, *and not*, with *Vav*. Indeed innumerable examples might be adduced which are like it. Again, when the Massorah enumerates a certain word which is in so many instances preceded by לֹא, but in none of them by וְלֹא, saying that this construction occurs so many times, we know positively that in all other places it is וְלֹא. Thus, for instance, it tells us that in fourteen verses occur לֹא, לֹא, and וְלֹא, וְלֹא, and *vice versa;* and so all the rest. The same is also the case with אֵת and וְאֵת, in Numb. xxxi. 22, upon which the Massorites remark: "And the sign is, *the gold belongs to the king*," and the meaning is, that this passage ought to be so, for there are two passages which take this ו before the second and the last nouns, whilst the remaining ones have no copulative, viz., the passages before us, and Joshua ix. 1. Now the meaning of this [Massoretic sign] is that *the gold*, which indicates the passage beginning with *but the gold* [Numb. xxxi. 22], is similar in construction, and belongs to *the king*, which indicates

ליה לא סבר ליה מר להא דרבא, אמר ליה מודה רבא בלא אבה יבמי,[55] עד כאן:

וכתבו התוספת וזה לשונם, לא אבה כתוב בספרים מדוייקים, וכן מוכח במסרת לא אבה ג׳ דסמיכי, לא אבה יי השחיתך, לא אבה יבמי, וישראל לא אבה לי, ויש שנים ריש פרשה במשנה תורה ולא אבה סיהון, ולא אבה יי לשמוע אל בלעם, ויש פסוק דלא שייכי לאותו מסורת ולא אבה נושא כליו דשאול, וגם אל מלך מואב שלח ולא אבה דיפתח, עד כאן לשון התוספת; הנך רואה בעיניך שאלולי המסורת היינו מסופקים אי הוה קרינן לא אבה או ולא אבה, ומדקאחזינן דבמסורת אמר דאינון ג׳ לא אבה, ומני דין חד מנהון, ידעינן בבידור דלא קרינן ולא אבה, ודכוותיה טובא לאין מספר; ותו במסרה מני לא ומלה אחרא ולית חד מנהון ולא, ואמר אינון כך וכך, בבירור ידעינן דשארא כתבין וקריין ולא, וכן המשל ארבע עשרה פסוקים אית בהון לא לא ולא ולא או ההפך וכן כולם, וכן את את ואת ואת, כהא דאמדינן אך את הזהב ואת הכסף את הנחשת את הברזל את הבדיל ואת העופרת, כתב עליו בעל המסורת וסימניך דהבא למלכיא, ופירש כי כך דינו, ואינון שני פסוקים דנסבין הלין ווי״ן תנינא ואת ובתרא ואת ושארא את דין ופסוק ויהי כשמוע׳ כל המלכים דיהושע החתי והאמורי הכנעני הפריזי החוי והיבוסי,

---

[55] The allusion to Rabe arises from the circumstance that he laid no weight on a pause. Compare *Jebamoth*, 106, *b*.

[37 *b*],[54] as quoted above, we should have walked about as blind men, and as those who are smitten with blindness, and could not have found any correct Codex, nor any scroll of the Law on which we could rely. Thus we could not have known whether a word has the ו conjunctive or not but for the Massorah, as Tossafoth remarks on this subject in connection with the Levirate law (*Jebamoth*, 106 *b*), where "Rabbi Abaja says the one who sends a letter of divorce must not pause after the לֹא, *not*, and thus read אָבָה יַבְּמִי, *he wants to perform the duty of levir* [Deut. xxv. 7], since this might convey the idea that he wants to marry her, &c. Now R. Ashai found R. Kahana, who, being perplexed about it, read וְלֹא אָבָה יַבְּמִי with ו conjunctive; where the former said to him, Have you not heard what Rabe said upon

אלחים וכולי, ודרשינן בנדרים פרק אין בין המודר וכולי עיין לעיל,[54] היינו הולכים כסומים וכמוכים בסנורים, ולא היה נמצא לנו ספר שיהית מוגה ולא ספר תורה שנוכל להסמך עליו; דמיון זה אם מלה אחת היא בוי"ו או בלא וי"ו, כגון ולא בוי"ו או לא בלא וי"ו, לא הוינן ידעין לאוכוחי כמאן, אלולי המסרה, כהא דכתבו התוספות ביבמות סוף פרק מצות חליצה, גבי אמר אביי האי מאן דמקרי גט חליצה לא ליקרי לרידה לא לחודיה, ואבה יבמי לחודיה, דמשמע אבה יבמי כולי. עד רב אשי אשכחיה לרב כהנא דקמצטער ומקרי לה, ולא אבה יבמי אמר

ἐπιθύμημα = חמד, *a desirable thing*, by changing *Resh* into *Daleth*, in order not to mention the ass as already stated. xii. Deut. iv. 19, where the sun, moon, and the stars, are said to have been apportioned to the nation as objects of worship, the word להאיר = διακοσμέω, *to shine*, has been inserted, so as to avoid the idolatry of the heathen being ascribed to God. xiii. Deut. xvii. 3, where we have the statement that God had not commanded *the Israelites* to worship other Gods, in accordance with Deut. iv. 19; it has been altered אשר לא צויתי לאומות לעבדם, *which I have forbidden the nations to worship*, to preclude the possibility of ascribing the origin of idolatry to the God of Israel.

It only remains to be added, that these alterations are also enumerated in the *Mechilta*, on Exod. xii. 40, p. 19, &c., ed. Weiss, Vienna, 1865; and in the Babylonian Talmud, *Megilla* 9 *a*, where, however, the following variations occur. i. The *Mechilta*, which contains the original account, says nothing about these alterations being restricted to thirteen. ii. It erroneously makes alteration ii. to consist in ונקוביר, and not in בראו. iii. It restricts alteration vii. to אבום only; and iv. It does not give the reason for alteration x., which is given in the Jerusalem Talmud. The variations in the Babylonian Talmud again, are as follows: i. It gives *fifteen* instead of thirteen alterations, adding the substitution of זאטוטי = ζητητής, for נערי, Exod. xxiv. 5, and for אצילי, *ibid.* xxiv. 11. The substitution of this Greek word in both these passages, shows that I was wrong in my strictures on Jacob b. Chajim's quotation (*vide supra*, p. 53, note 31). ii. It rightly gives בראו, as alteration iii., Gen. i. 2 (v. 2). iii. It states that these alterations were made in the Pentateuch, and by seventy-two elders, which is not mentioned in the other records. Of these thirteen alterations so minutely described in these documents, there are only eight to be found in the present recensions of the Septuagint, viz., Gen. i. 1, ii. 2, xviii. 12, xlix. 6; Exod. iv. 20, xii. 40; Levit. xi. 16 (Deut. xiv. 7); Numb. xvi. 15. Comp. Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, p. 25, &c.; Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, p. 439, &c., Breslau, 1857; Weiss, *Commentary on the Mechilta*, p. 19, &c., Vienna, 1865.

[54] *Vide supra*, p. 48, &c.

But for the men of the Great Synagogue who restored the crown to its ancient state, as it is written, "They read in the law of God," &c. [Nehem. viii. 8], see *Nedarim*

ואלולי אנשי כנסת הגדולה שהחזירו
העטרה ליושנה כרכתיב, ויקראו בספר תורת

to remove certain offensive expressions, and to prevent misunderstanding the text. They are as follows according to the order of *Jerusalem Talmud*, to which Jacob Ibn Adonijah evidently refers.—i. Gen. i. 1–3, according to the structure of the language, and the most ancient traditions still preserved by Rashi and Ibn Ezra, is to be rendered "*In the beginning when* God created heaven and earth [*i. e.*, the universe, comp. ii. 1, 4], and the earth was still desolate and void, and darkness was upon the face of the earth, and the spirit of God hovered upon the face of the earth, then God said let there be light," &c. But as this presupposes the existence of primordial waters, and of a chaotic mass, which by the draining of the waters on the second day became the formed earth, it was thought necessary in translating the Bible into Greek, and in opposition to the Greek cosmogony and polytheism, to lay great stress on the absolute unity of God, and on the absolute creation from nothing. Hence the word בראשית, had to be made independent of the following verses, and to be rendered *in the beginning* ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς, instead of in the beginning WHEN. This change the Talmud indicates by the pregnant construction אלהים ברא בראשית, thus placing בראשית last, and precluding every other translation than *God created in the beginning.* (Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 344, &c). ii. Gen. i. 26, where "let *us* make man in *our* image, after *our* likeness," has been altered into "*I* will make man in the image, and in the likeness," to remove the appearance of polytheism. iii. Gen. ii. 2, where "and he ended on *the seventh* (השביעי) day," has been changed into (הששי) *the sixth* day, to avoid the apparent contradiction, since God did not work on the seventh day. iv. Gen. v. 2 (i. 27), where "male and female created he *them*" (ברא אתם, בראם), has been altered into *created he him* (בְּרָאוֹ), to remove the apparent contradiction in the passage where the man and woman are spoken of as having been created together, or simultaneously, and ii. 21–23, where the woman is described as having been made out of the man ; as well as to introduce into the version the notion which obtained among the Jews, that man was created an hermaphrodite, thus showing the Greeks, that the Hebrew, like their philosopher, believed man to have been originally androgynous (comp. *Midrash Rabba*, on Gen. i. 26, section viii., p. 10 *a*, ed. Stettin, 1863, with Plato, *Synposion*, p. 84, &c., ed. Engelmann). v. Gen. xi. 7, "let *us* go down, and let *us* confound" (נרדה ונבלה), has been changed into "*I* will go down, and *I* will confound" (ארדה ואבלה), to remove the apparent polytheism. vi. Gen. xviii. 12, "after my decay, I had again pleasure," has been altered into אחרי בְּלֹתִי היתה לי עֶדְנָה, οὔπω μέν μοι γέγονεν ἕως τοῦ νῦν, *after it had been thus with me hitherto*, to avoid the offensive application to the distinguished mother of Israel of the expression בָּלָה, which is used for rotten old garments (comp. Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 415, &c). vii. Gen. xlix. 6, "in their anger they slew a man, and in their self-will they hamstrung an ox," has been altered into "in their anger they slew an ox (שׁוֹר), and in their self-will they hamstrung a fatted bull (אֲבוּם), to do away with the wholesale slaughter of men. viii. Exod. iv. 20, חמור, *ass*, is altered into ὑποζύγια, *beasts of burden*, because of the reluctance which the translator had to mention the name of this beast. ix. In Exod. xii 40, *and all other lands*, *i. e.*, "the land of Canaan" has been added, in order to remove the apparent contradiction, since the Israelites did not sojourn four hundred and thirty years in Egypt. x. In Levit. xi. 6, and Deut. xiv. 7, ארנבת = λαγός, *a hare*, has been altered into χοιρογρούλλος, *porcupine*, or *hedgehog*, to avoid giving offence to the Ptolemy family, whose name was *Lagos*. xi. In Numb. xvi. 15, חמר, *ass*, has been altered into

ולומר, י״ח מלין תיקון סופרים כדגרסינן במכילתא;[52] ועוד דלא שינו חס ושלום הסופרים ולא תקנו, אלא שכך היה לו לומר אלא מפני שכנה הכתוב מפני כבוד השכינה ודוק ותשכח: וכן בקרי וכתיב הא מראים מה דשינו, אם תמצא לומר דחס ושלום שינו, אבל אנו כת המאמינים נאמין דכולהון הלכה למשה מסני, וכן בתיקון סופרים, אפילו אם תמצא לומר שתקנו הסופרים, לא מעלה ולא מוריד במה שהמינים פוקרים, וראה גם ראה בעובדא דתלמי המלך בשלשה עשר דבר ששינו, שבפירש נאמר למה שינו, ומה שינו במה שכתבו לו,[53] סוף דבר בזה אין להם פה להשיב:

they would surely not have proclaimed what they have changed, and said, "Eighteen words are *Tikun Sopherim*, as given in the *Mechiltha*" [on Exod. xv. 7].[52] Moreover, the Sopherim made no changes nor corrections, they only submitted that the text ought originally to have been so and so, but is veiled in other expressions, out of respect to *the Shechina*, as you will find out by examining the subject. The same is the case with *the Keri* and *the Kethiv;* they [*i. e.*, the *Sopherim*] point out what they have altered, if peradventure you choose to characterise them as alterations; we of the class of believers, however, believe that they all are a law of Moses from Sinai [*i. e.*, the original readings], including the emendations of the Scribes. But even if you still insist that the Sopherim did make alterations, the alterations in question neither raise nor lower the points upon which the heretics rest. Consult, also, the work done for Ptolemy the king, and you will see that in the thirteen instances where they made changes, they state the reason why they have made these alterations, and what these alterations are in what they did for him.[53] In conclusion, the heretics can have nothing to say in this matter.

---

burden (עליך) TO THEE," is altered into "*so that I am a burden* (אלי) TO MYSELF," to remove its offensiveness. xvii. Job xxxii. 3, where the original, "*they condemned* (את אלהים, or את הדין) GOD OR THE DIVINE JUSTICE," is altered into "*they condemned* (את איוב) JOB," for the same reason as the foregoing. And xviii. Lam. iii. 19, where the inspired writer calls on God to remember his sufferings, and then expresses his conviction, "*yea thou wilt remember, and* THY SOUL WILL MOURN OVER ME (וְתָשִׁיחַ עָלַי נַפְשֶׁךָ), this is altered into "*and my soul is humbled within me* (וְתָשׁוֹחַ עָלַי נַפְשִׁי), because of the remark that God will mourn. These eighteen *Decrees of the Scribes* are enumerated in the Massorah magna on Numb. i. 1, and on Ps. cvi. 20, and in the Massoretic work *Ochla Ve-Ochlah*, p. 113. The whole question of the *Tikun Sopherim* is most elaborately discussed by Pinsker, in the *Hebrew Annual* called *Kerem Chemed*, vol. ix., pp. 52, etc., Berlin, 1856, and Geiger *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, p. 308, etc., Breslau, 1857.

[52] *The Mechiltha* מכלתא is a Midrashic exposition of Exodus xii.—xxxv. 3, attributed to R. Ishmael ben Elisha, who flourished in the first century of the Christian era. For a description of the Mechiltha, as well as for R. Ishmael b. Elisha's rules of interpretation and influence on Biblical exegesis, see Alexander's edition of Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, *s. v.* ISHMAEL BEN ELISHA, and MIDRASH. The passage referred to, is to be found in Exod. xv. 7, section vi., p. 47, &c., ed. Weiss, Vienna, 1865.

[53] The work for King Ptolemy, referred to in the text, is the Septuagint, in which the translators, according to ancient tradition, designedly made thirteen alterations, in order

cially in the Prophets? Yet we find the Massorah declares "In five passages the *Vav* has been removed by the Scribes," &c. Again "eighteen words are emendations of the Scribes," &c.[51] Now if they had intended to make wilful changes,

ראו מה החלפתי, וכל שכן בדברי הנבואות,
והנה לשון המסרה חמש מלין עטור סופרים
כולי, וכן שמונה עשר מלין תקון סופרים, אם
היה דעתם לשנות,[51] לא היו מגלים מה ששינו

---

[51] The eighteen *Tikun Sopherim* (תיקין סופרים) = *Emendations of the Scribes*, refer to eighteen alterations which the Scribes decreed should be introduced into the text, in order to remove anthropomorphisms and other indelicate expressions. These eighteen emendations (י״ח מלין) are as follows according to the order of the Hebrew Bible:—i. Gen. xviii. 22, where, for the original reading ויהוה עודני עמד לפני אברהם, *and Jehovah still stood before Abraham*, is now substituted by the decree of the Scribes = *Tikun Sopherim*, ואברהם עודנו עמד לפני יהוה, *and Abraham still stood before Jehovah*, because it appeared offensive to say that the Deity stood before Abraham. ii. Numb. xi. 15, where Moses addresses God, "*Kill me, I pray thee . . . . that I may not see* (ברעתך) THY EVIL," *i. e.*, the punishment wherewith thou visitest Israel, is altered into "*that I may not see* (ברעתי) MY EVIL," because it might seem as if evil were ascribed to the Deity. iii. and iv. Numb. xii. 12, where the original reading, "*let her not be as one dead, who proceeded from the womb of* (אמנו) OUR MOTHER, *and half of* (בשרנו) OUR FLESH *be consumed*," is altered into "*let her not be as one dead born, which when it proceeds from the womb of* (אמו) ITS MOTHER *has half of* ITS FLESH (בשרו) *consumed*;" here are two Sopheric emendations. v. 1 Sam. iii. 13, where the original "*for his sons cursed* (אלהים) GOD" (as the Sept. still has it Θεὸν), is altered into "*for his sons cursed* (להם) THEMSELVES," because it was too offensive to say that the sons of Eli cursed God, and that Eli knew it and did not reprimand them for it. vi. 2 Sam. xvi. 12, where "*will God see* (בעינו) WITH HIS EYE," is altered into "*will God look* (בעוני) AT MY AFFLICTION," because it was too anthropomorphitic. vii. 1 Kings xii. 16, where "To HIS GOD (לאלהיו) *O Israel . . . . and Israel went* (לאלהיו) TO THEIR GOD," is altered into "To YOUR TENTS (לאהליך) *O Israel . . . . and Israel departed* (לאהליו) TO THEIR TENTS," because the separation of Israel from the house of David was regarded as a necessary transition to idolatry; it was looked upon as leaving God and the sanctuary for the worship of idolatry in tents. viii. 2 Chron. x. 16, where the parallel passage is similarly altered, for the same reason. ix. Jer. ii. 11, where "*my people have changed* (כבודי) MY GLORY *for an idol*," is altered into "*have changed* (כבודו) THEIR GLORY *into an idol*," because it was too offensive to say such a thing. x. Ezek. viii. 17, where "*they have put the rod to* (אפי) MY NOSE," is altered into "*they have put the rod to* (אפם) THEIR NOSE," because of its offensiveness, and to avoid too gross an anthropomorphism. xi. Hos. iv. 7, where "*they have changed* (כבודי) MY GLORY *into shame*," is altered into "*I will change their glory into shame*" (כבודם בקלון אמיר), for the same reason which dictated the ninth alteration. xii. Hab. i. 12, where the address of the prophet to God, "THOU DIEST NOT" (תמות), is altered into "WE shall not die" (נמות), because it was deemed improper. xiii. Zech. ii. 12, where "*the apple of* (עיני) MINE EYE," is altered into "*the apple of* (עינו) HIS EYE," for the reason which called forth the tenth emendation. xiv. Mal. i. 13, where "*ye make* (אותי) ME *expire*," is altered into "*ye weary* (אותו) IT," because of its being too gross an anthropomorphism. xv. Ps. cvi. 20, where "*they have changed* (כבודי) MY GLORY *into the similitude of an ox*.' is altered into "*they have changed* (כבודם) THEIR GLORY *into the similitude of an ox*," as in Jer. ii. 11 and Hos. iv. 7. xvi. Job. vii. 20, where Job's address to God, "*am I a*

the Scribes, the alterations of the Scribes, *Keri* and *Kethiv*, &c.,[50] because by *Itur Sopherim* is not meant that they [*i. e.*, the Scribes] have removed the ו, but as it is explained in the *Aruch* under עטור; where it is remarked *Itur Sopherim* denotes *removal*, as the Chaldee renders סוּר, *to remove* [1 Kings xxii. 44], by עֲטַר; and so we find in *Gittin*, 86, the nature of the bill of divorce is "absolved and (ועטיר), *discharged*." Now it appears that the villagers were at first not particular in reading the Scriptures, and read וְאַחַר, AND *afterward* [Gen. xviii. 5, Ps. lxviii. 26]; וּמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ, AND *thy judgments* [Ps. xxxvi. 7]: they committed a blunder at that time [by inserting *Vav* conjunctive in these passages], thinking that these were the correct readings because they seemed to be so. Whereupon the Sopherim came and removed the *Vav*, and the reading became again, as it originally was, אַחַר, *afterwards*, מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ, *thy judgments;* and when it was seen that the Sopherim had removed the *Vav*, the words thus corrected were denominated *Itur Sopherim*. Rabbi Isaac, therefore, came and propounded that they [*i.e.*, these restored readings] are those received by Moses on Sinai [*i. e.*, are the original readings]. And even up to the generations nearer that time they blundered and read וְלֹא, *and not*, with *Vav* [Exod. xxiii. 13], when the Sopherim decreed that it should be read without a *Vav*." Thus far his argument.

סופרים, ותיקון סופרים,[50] וקרי וכתיב וזולתם, דהא בעטור סופרים חס ושלום לא סליקו להנהו וי״ו, אלא כדפירש בערוך בערך עטר ראמר וזה לשון עטור סופרים פירושו לשון עטירה הוא, תרגום רק הבמות לא סרו לא עטרו; וכן הא דגרסינן בפרק המגרש בגמרא גופו של גט פטיר ועטיר, כלומר פטור ומסולק, ונראים הדברים שבתחלה אנשי כפרים לא הוו דייקי במקרא, והוו קרו וסעדו לבכם ואחר תעבורו, קרמו שרים ואחר נוגנים, צדקתך כהררי אל ומשפטיך תהום רבה, והוו משתבשי באילין מילי בההוא זמן, וסברי דהכי דקדוק משום דהכי מסתבר, ואתו סופרים וסלקי להני וי״ו, והוו קרי אחר תעבורו, אחר נוגנים, משפטיך תהום רבה, וכד חזו סופרים קא עטרי להו להלין וי״ו, והוו קרו להו להלין מלי עטור סופרים, ואתא רבי יצחק ואורי דקבלה אינון הלכה למשה מסיני, ועד דורות קרובים להשתא הוו משתבשי וקראו ולא ישמע על פיך, וסופרי מגמרי דלא מקרי בוי״ו, עד כאן לשונו;

הנך רואה כי לא שנו כלל חס ושלום, ואם יקשו דליתא לדברי הגאון זכרונו לברכה, נשיב עליהם מכח הסברה, היעלה על לב אדם שרוצה לשנות ולהחליף דבר יאמר,

Thus it is evident that they [*i. e.*, the Sopherim] made no wilful changes. But if they [*i. e.*, the heretics] will persist in it in spite of what the Gaon [*i. e.*, the author of the *Aruch*], of blessed memory says, we can repel them with the power of argument as follows. Can any man believe that if one intends to make wilful alterations and changes he would say, See what wilful changes I have made, espeof *plene* and *defective*. According to whom [I asked myself] are we then to write the scrolls of the law, since what is lawful according to the one is unlawful according to the other? At the first thought it would seem that we ought to write our scrolls according to the Talmud in the case of *plene* and *defective*, since we have taken it upon ourselves [to follow its authority], and since they [*i. e.*, the authors of the Talmud] were better versed in the Mossorah, as well as in *plene* and *defective*, than we are. Nevertheless, we find that Rashi, of blessed memory, draws objections from the Massorah against our Talmud, as in the case of the sons of Eli [1 Sam. ii. 24], and even declares that the statement in the Talmud that *the Kethiv* מְעֻבְרִים is a mistake, as we have shewn above.[48] The authors of the Tassafoth, too, raise objections from the Massorah against the Talmud, and make the Massorah their basis, as will be seen in the sequel from a quotation in *Tract Jebamoth* [106 *b*] Now if the Massorah were not their basis, they would not have argued from it against the Talmud. But since we see that though they were later than the Talmudists, and yet made the Massorah their basis to argue from it against the Talmud, it is evident that we too must act according to the Massorah. And, indeed, this is the reason why the Codices and the corrections of the scrolls are all according to the Massorah; and of a truth the men of the Great Synagogue [*i. e.*, the authors of the Massorah] are of great authority, and fully worthy that we should rely upon them. And though Rashi, of blessed memory, as we have seen, sides with Rabbi Meier in the Talmud, in the case of מְזֻזֹת, against the Massorah, taking *the Kethiv* to be מְזֻזוֹת, as we have stated above,[49] and in many other cases, yet we also see that in other places he argues from the Massorah against the Talmud, as I have shewn in this section.

---

[50] The heretics or Christians to whom Jacob b. Chajim refers, have taken their inspiration from Raymond Martin, the celebrated Spanish Dominican, who was born about 1220, and died about 1287. It was this distinguished orientalist, the oracle of the church on Rabbinical lore during the middle ages, who boldly declared that these variations in question were wilful corruptions and perversions introduced by the Jews into the sacred text. Comp. Levita's *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, p. 45, &c., ed. Ginsburg.

As to the heretics, there is no foundation in the charge which they prefer against us, that we have wilfully altered and changed the text of the Scriptures, which they derive from the removal of *Vav* by

כדברירנא לעיל במלא וחסר, אליבא דמאן ניכתוב ספר תורה, דהא מה שכשר לזה פסול לזה; לפום דיהטא נראה למימר דכתלמודא דילן נכתוב ספר תורה במלא וחסר, מאחר דקבלנוהו עלינו, ואינון הוו בקיאי במסרה ובמלא וחסר יתיר מינן; ומיהו חזינן לרש״י זכרונו לברכה דהא הוא מקשה מהמסרה לתלמודא דילן, גבי בני עלי, ואמר דטעות הוא מה דאמר בגמרא מעבירם כתיב כדכתיבנא לעיל;[48] וגם בעלי התוספות מקשין מהמסרה לתלמודא דילן, ועבדי עיקר מהמסרה, וכדלקמן ביבמות סוף פרק מצות חליצה אמר אביי כולי, ואם המסרה לא הוה עיקר לא הוו מקשים מינה לתלמודא, ומדקא חזינן דאינון בתראי, והוו עבדי עיקר מהמסרה לאקשויי מינה לתלמודא, משמע דאליבא דמסרה קא עבדינן, ותו דכולהו ספרי, ותקון ספר תורה, כולהו אליבא דמסרה, ואנשי כנסת הגדולה גדולים הוו, ואיכא למיסמך עליהון; ואף על גב דקא חזינן דרש״י זכרונו לברכה, גבי מזוזות דפרשת ואתחנן, סבירא ליה כרבי מאיר מזוזת כתיב, כדפריכנא לעיל,[49] וכך בכמה דוכתי, הא חזינן דבדוכתא אחריתי מקשה מהמסרה לתלמודא, כנזכר לעיל:

ולא קשה מידי מה דמקשים המינים, דאנן שנינן וחלפינן בתורה, מדקא חזו עטור

---

[48] *Vide supra*, p. 57, &c.

[49] *Vide supra*, p. 59, &c.

in any of the Massoretic work. Thus, for instance, Rashi, of blessed memory, in his commentary on Psalm cvliv. 2, remarks that in his copy *the Keri* was תַּחְתּוֹ, *under him*, and *the Kethiv* תַּחְתַּי, *under me*, and I carefully looked for it, but could not find it in the Massorah magna numbered among the eighteen words in which the ו is omitted at the end of the word.[46] And this, again, is the language of Rabbi Saadia Gaon on Daniel xi. 15, "*The Kethiv* is מִבְחָרָיו, *of his choice*, and *the Keri* מִבְצָרָיו, *of his fortresses*."[47] Now, I carefully examined the Massoretic books in all the places where the letters are changed, but could not find it; and my difficulty is [to understand] how these Gaonim could overlook the Massorah, for, according to the Massorah which we have, their statements are incorrect. However, they [Saadia and Rashi] are much wiser then we, who are as it were blind men in a window compared with them.

שהביאו קרי וכתיב מה שלא נמצא בשום ספר מספרי המסרה, וזה לשון רש"י בפירוש תלים בפסוק הרודד עמים תחתי, כתב שבספרו היה קרי תחתיו וכתיב תחתי, ובקשתי ולא מצאתיו במסרה גדולה שיהיה נמנה בחשבון השמונה עשרה מלין דחסרים בהון וי"ו בסוף תיבותא;[46] וזה לשון רבינו סעדיה גאון בסוף דניאל, בפסוק ויבא מלך הצפון וישפוך סוללה ולכד קרי וכתיב זאת המלה, מבחריו כתיב וקרי מבצריו,[47] ובקשתי בספרי המסרה בכל חלופי האותיות ולא מצאהיו, וקשה לי איך נעלם מהגאונים האלה המסרה, דאליבא דמסרה דאית לן הוא טעות, ומיהו בקיאי הוו יתיר מנן בכל מלי, ואנן כסומים בארובה לגביהו:

נתקשה בעיני זה כמה ימים, מאחר דאורחיה דתלמודא להכחיש המסורת,

For some time I was in great perplexity, seeing that the Talmud generally ignores the Massorah, as we have shewn above in the instance

---

Egypt, A. D. 892, and died in 942. It is somewhat strange that Jacob ben Chajim should name him *after* Rashi, who lived so much later. The title *Gaon*, which denotes *excellency*, was given to those who were the spiritual heads of the Jewish community.

[46] The eighteen words, which according to the Massorah want the suffix *Vav* in the text, are as follows:—

וישתחו	Gen. xxvii. 29	וישתחו	1 Kings ix. 9	והללוה	Ezek. vii. 21
וישתחו	Gen. xliii. 28	וידבר	1 Kings xii. 7	שוי	Dan. v. 21
ויצו	Judg. xxi. 20	יקח	2 Kings xx. 18	ויעל	Ezra iii. 2
ויעלה	1 Sam. vii. 9	ויתנה	2 Kings xxii. 5	אחרי	Nehem. iii. 30
ויאמר	1 Sam. xii. 10	ואכול	Isaiah xxxvii. 30	אחרי	Nehem. iii. 31
אמר	1 Sam. xiii. 19	יחד	Jerem. xlviii. 7	וקבל	Esther ix. 27

These instances are enumerated in the Massorah marginalis, on 1 Kings i. 1; in the Massorah finalis under letter *Vav*, p. 27 *a*, col. 4—27 *b*, col. 1; *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, section cxix., and *Tractate Sopherim* vii. 1. It is, however, to be remarked, that *Sopherim* only gives thirteen instances, וישתחו (Gen. xliii. 28); ויצו (Judges xxi. 20); and אחרי (Nehem. iii. 30), being omitted. Comp. also Frensdorff's note on section cxix., *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, p. 32, and Levita's *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, p. 117, note 69, ed. Ginsburg.

[47] It is now established beyond doubt, that the commentary on Daniel which Jacob b. Chajim Ibn Adonijah published in the Rabbinic Bible, under the name of Saadia, and which he here quotes is spurious. Comp. the article SAADIA, in Kitto's *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*.

הספרים המדויקים שלנו, ולא ידענא מה לתרוצי, אלא כדתריצנא לעיל, דאורחיה דתלמודא לפלוגי על המסורת:

ובבראשית רבה מצאתי על פסוק לאסור שריו בנפשו, אמר רב אידי שרו כתיב חסר יו״ד זה היה פוטיפר, וקשה כי לא נמצא בשום ספר שיהיה חסר, וגם במסרה רבתא לא נמנה בחשבון החמשים ושש חסר יו״ד במצעות תיבות וקריין,[44] ואין דרך לתרוצי כי אם כמה דתרוצנא, דאורחיה דתלמודא לחכחיש המסורת:

ואיכא לתמהויי טובא במה דאשכחית לרש״י זכרונו לברכה ולרבינו סעדיה גאון,[45]

and, indeed, all our best Codices do the same. Now, I cannot account for this in any other way except in the manner already stated above, viz., that the Talmud is sometimes at variance with the Massorah.

In *Bereshith Rabba*, Rabbi Idia remarks on Psalm cv. 22, that *the Kethiv* is שָׂרָו, *his prince*, without a י [*i. e.*, in the singular], and that it refers to Potiphera. Now the difficulty is, that we do not find this י omitted in any Codex; nor is it mentioned in the Massorah magna among the number of fifty-six passages where the י is omitted in the text and found in *the Keri*;[44] and there is no way of accounting for this again, except as I accounted for the manner of the Talmud, viz., that it disagrees with the Massorah.

It is very suprising that we find Rashi, of blessed memory, and Saadia Gaon,[45] giving *Keris* and *Kethivs* which are not to be found

---

[44] The fifty-six words which are in the textual reading without *Jod* (mostly indicating the plural) in the middle, but have *Jod* in the marginal reading, are as follows:—

צוארו	Gen. xxxiii. 4	אלמנתו	Jerem. xv. 8	גבורתו	Job xxvi. 14
ועמורו	Exod. xxvii. 11	ומו	Jerem. xvii. 11	בתחבולתו	Job xxxvii. 12
ענו	Numb. xii. 3	מברחו	Ezek. xvii. 21	ואפרוחו	Job xxxix. 30
בינו	Joshua viii. 11	פארתו	Ezek. xxxi. 5	פחדו	Job xl. 17
תוצאותו	Joshua xvi. 3	עולתו	Ezek. xl. 26	כנפו	Job xxxix. 23
מריבו	1 Sam. ii. 9	וחלונן	Ezek. xl. 22	חלצו	Job xxxi. 20
עלו	1 Sam. ii. 9	ותמורו	Ezek. xl. 22	ילדו	Job xxxviii. 41
למשפחתו	1 Sam. x. 21	בצאתו	Ezek. xlvii. 11	ברגלו	Prov. vi. 13
ואנשו	1 Sam. xxiii. 5	פרזו	Habak. iii. 14	בשפתו	Prov. xxvi. 24
בבגדו	2 Sam. i. 11	שערו	Obad. 11	ארחתו	Prov. xxii. 25
שמלתו	2 Sam. xii. 20	דרשו	Ps. xxiv. 6	אדנו	Prov. xxx. 10
רחמו	2 Sam. xxiv. 14	חצו	Ps. lviii. 8	מרגלותו	Ruth iii. 14
משרתו	1 Kings x. 5	חסדו	Ps. cvi. 45	כנותו	Ezra iv. 7
ברכו	1 Kings xviii. 42	דברו	Ps. cxlvii. 19	חטאו	Lament. iii. 39
בסוסו	2 Kings v. 9	צבאו	Ps. cxlviii. 2	ויתו	1 Sam. xxi. 14
כפו	2 Kings iv. 34	חקו	Job xiv. 5	הסתו	Song of Songs ii. 11
מזבחתו	2 Kings xi. 18	בקדשו	Job xv. 15	שלו	Ps. cv. 40
צפו	Isa. lvi. 10	עלומו	Job xx. 11	השלו	Numb. xi 32
משלו	Isa. lii. 5	וידעו	Job xxiv. 1		

They are enumerated in the Massorah finalis under the letter *Jod*, p. 34 *a*, cols. 2 and 3; and in the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, section cxxviii., pp. 33 and 104. It must be remarked, that this list only registers such words as occur *once* as *defective*, and therefore excludes many other words which likewise want the *Jod* plural, but which occur more than once. Comp. also Levita's *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, p. 183, ed. Ginsburg.

[45] *Saadia Gaon* (סעדיה גאון) *ben Joseph Ha-Pithomi*, the celebrated philosopher, commentator, and translator of the Bible into Arabic, was born at Fajum, in Upper

is taken from וְיָסַף, *and he shall add*, converted into the allied letter י, and put between the ת and ו of חֲמִשִׁתוֹ, thus reading חֲמִשִׁתָיו." But Tossafoth objects to this explanation, on the ground that the Talmud asks further on, "If this can be done, let us apply it also to the things devoted to the sanctuary, where it is likewise written וְיָסַף חֲמִישִׁית [Lev. xxvii. 15]?" And the answer is, "Even if you take away the ו from וְיָסַף, and put it to the end of חֲמִישִׁית, it would only be חֲמִישִׁיתוֹ [making no plural]." But now [if Rabbi Tam's principle of applying this exegetical rule be right] we might put the ו in the middle of the word, so as to obtain חֲמִישִׁיוֹת *plural.* It is therefore evident that we never put the letters except at the end of the word, as is the case with all the instances which I have adduced." Thus far the words of Tossafoth. Rashi, of blessed memory, too, quotes the same principle [in his Commentary, on *Baba Meziah*, 54 *b*], that we only add to the beginning and end of words, but that in the middle the letters must remain as they are [*vide in loco*]. And we cannot urge in such a case that we cut up the Scriptures with too sharp a knife, as it is urged in all other places, because it cannot be called cutting except when the words are displaced, as it is remarked there [*i. e.*, in *Baba Bathra*, 111] in connection with the verse "and ye shall give his inheritance," &c. [Numb. xxvii. 11], against Rabbi Abja, who wanted to do it; and Rabbi said to him, "Thou cuttest the Scriptures with a sharp knife." Thus far his reply.

ליה באמצע תיבה והוה ליה חמישיתיו, ומוקמינן ליה במקום יו'ד באמצע תיבה; וקשה לפירושו דפריך בתר חכי, אי הכי גבי הקרש נמי דכתיב ויסף חמישית כולי, ומשני דכי שקלת לוי'ו דויסף הוה ליה חמישיתו, והשתא לוקמינן באמצע תיבה דלהוו חמשיות הרבה, הילכך נראה דבשום פעם לא מוקמינן אלא בסוף תיבה ככל הני שחבאתי, עד כאן לשון התוספות; וכך העלה רש'י וכרונו לברכה שם פירש הזהב דלא מוסיפין אלא בראש תיבה או בסופה, אבל באמצע כדקאי קאי עיין שם; וליכא למיפרך בכהאי גוונא סכינא חריפא מפסקינהו לקראי, כדפריך בכל דוכתא, משום דלא מיקרא הפסקה אלא דוקא בתיבות להקדים תיבה זו לזו, כדאמרינן התם מעיקרא גבי הך קרא דונתתם את נהלתו רסבר אביי למימר תירץ, ואמר ליה רבא סכינא חריפא מפסקינהו לקראי, עד כאן:

יקשה בעיני דבגמרא בהדיא גרסינן בפרק הקורא את המגלה עומד, תנו רבנן כל המקראות הכתובים בתורה לגנאי קורין אותן לשבח, כגון ישגלנה ישכבנה, בעפולים בטחורים, ובמסורת לא מני כי אם ששה דכתיב בעפולים קרי בטחורים, ומשמיט ההוא דשמואל דפסוק וישימו את ארון יי׳ אל העגלה, כתיב וקרי טחורים, וכן הוא בכל

It appears difficult to me, that when we are distinctly told in the Talmud [Megilla, 24 *b*.], "The sages say that all passages which are written in the law in indelicate expressions are rendered decent by *the Keri*, as, for instance, יִשְׁכָּבֶנָּה instead of יִשְׁגָּלֶנָּה [Deut. xxxviii. 30; Isa. xiii. 16; Jer. iii. 2; 1 Sam. v. 6, 9, 12; vi. 4, 5, 17]; טְחֹרִים instead of עֳפָלִים; the Massorah should only give six instances where *the Kethiv* is עֳפָלִים," and *the Keri* טְחֹרִים [Deut. xxviii. 27; 1 Sam. v. 6, 9, 12; vi. 5, 6], and omit the one which occurs in 1 Sam. vi. 12;

והיה אם שמוע כתיב לטטפת, והיה כי יביאך ולטוטפת, אבל בין פ׳א לתי׳ו לא כתיב וי׳ו, ואני ראיתי בספר תגי קדמון שגם והיה אם שמוע כתוב לטוטפת, ומיהו סמכינן אמאי דגרסי התוספות כדלקמן דאינהו חזו ספר תגי, והוו בקיאי במלא וחסר יתיר מינן; והקשו התוספות שם במנחות[42] גבי תנו רבנן לטטפת וכולי דלעיל על לטוטפות דוהיה כי יביאך דבגמרא מצריך שיהא מלא דמלא, ובספרים מדוייקים כך דינם, שמע והיה אם שמוע לטטפת, וחיה כי יביאך ולטוטפת, אבל בין פ׳א לתי׳ו לא כתיב וי׳ו, תימה היכי משמע תרי, ואי הוה אמרינן גורעין ומוסיפי; ודורשין ניחא, אבל לא אשכחן אלא בתחלת תיבה ובסוף תיבה, בפרק שני דזבחים גבי ולקחו מדם הפר דדרשינן דם מחפר יקבלנו, וכן ונתתם את נחלתו לשארו, דדרשינן בפרק יש נוחלין ונתתם נהלת שארו לו, ומפרש רבינו תם[43] דוי׳ו קמא דולטוטפת מוקמינן בסוף, כאלו כתוב לטטפות, כדאשכחן בפרק הזהב אי שקלת ליה לוי׳ו דויסף ושדית ליה על חמישיתו הוה ליה חמישיתו, והשתא מוקמינן

[in Deut. vi. 8; xi. 18] and וּלְטֹטָפֹת [Exod. xiii. 16], but there is no ו between the פ and the ת; yet I myself have seen that in the ancient Book of the Crowns, even לְטוֹטָפֹת, in Deut. xi. 18, is written with a ו after the the first ט. Still we may rely upon the authors of the Tossafoth, since they saw the Book of Crowns, and know more thoroughly about *plene* and *defective* than we know. Tossafoth on *Menachoth* [34 *b*] observes as follows:[42] "In Deut. vi. 8 and xi. 18, the reading is לְטֹטָפֹת, and in Exod. xiii. 16, וּלְטוֹטָפֹת, according to the correct Codices, but there is no ו between the פ and ת," and asks, "How can a dual be made out of it? If we could apply to it the exegetical rule, *letters taken from one word and joined to another, or formed into new words*, it would be all right, but we find it only applied to letters at the end and beginning of words, but not in the middle. Thus, for instance, in *Zebachim*, 24 *b*, the first מ is taken over from מִדַּם, *from the blood*, to הַפָּר, *of the bullock*, making it דַּם מֵהַפָּר, *the blood of the bullock* [Exod. xxxix. 12]. Thus also in *Baba Bathra*, 111, the ו is taken from the end of נַחֲלָתוֹ, *his inheritance*, and the ל from the beginning of לִשְׁאֵרוֹ, *to his kinsmen*, and made into a separate word לוֹ, *i. e.*, וּנְתַתֶּם אֶת נַחֲלַת שְׁאֵרוֹ לוֹ, *and ye shall give the inheritance of his wife to him*, *i. e.*, the husband [Numb. xxvii. 11]. To this, Rabbi Tam[43] replies, that the first ו of וּלְטוֹטָפֹת [*i. e.*, the copulative] is taken from the beginning of the word and put between the ת and פ, thus reading לְטוֹטָפוֹת, as we find it done in *Baba Meziah* [54 *b*], on Lev. xxvii. 27, where the ו

---

found on p. 9. It must, however, be remarked that in the present recension it is spelled לטטפות, both in Exod. xiii. 16 and Deut. vi, 8. Comp. also the *Sepher Tagin*, pp. 18, 19.

[42] As Jacob ben Chajim has somewhat abbreviated this quotation from Tossafoth, and thereby made it difficult to translate, I have translated the whole of it as found in the Talmud.

[43] Jacob Tam was born at Remers about 1100, and died about 1171. He was the grandson of the immortal Rashi, and was a very distinguished Talmudist, Tossaphist (*vide supra*, p. 57, note 34), Grammarian, and Commentator, The appellation Tam (תם) = *the pious*, *the saint*, he obtained in after life because of his great piety, and in allusion to Gen. xxv. 27, where his namesake, the patriarch Jacob, is denominated *Tam*.

ונסכיה, בשביעי כמשפטם, הרי מ׳ם יו׳ד מ׳ם,[38] מכאן רמז לניסוך המים מן התורה וכולי; ורש׳י זכרונו לברכה גרים במקום בשביעי כמשפטם, בשמיני כמשפטם,[39] וזה לשון התוספת בשביעי כמשפטם גרסינן כדמוכח בפרק קמא דתענית וכן הוא במסורת הגדולה ודלא כרש׳י זכרונו לברכה דגרים בשמיני בסוף פרק לולב וערבה, עד כאן לשון התוספת:

וגם בההיא דמנחות רש׳י זכרונו לברכה לא הקשה לתלמודא דפליג על הספרים המדוייקים, כמו דהקשה גבי בני עלי, וזה לשון הגמרא שם בפרק הקומץ את המנחה, תנו רבנן לטטפת לטטפת לטוטפת[40] הרי כאן דרש דברי רבי ישמעאל כולי עד כאן לשון הגמרא. ובספרים מדוייקים ובספר תגי[41] כך דינם, שמע

to the seventh day,[38] whence we obtain the final ם [of the first], the י [from the second], and the final ם [from the third word]; and have therein an intimation from the law about the ceremony of pouring out water on this festival. Whereas Rashi, of blessed memory, reads [*Succa*, 46 *b*] כְּמִשְׁפָּטָם in connection with the eighth day of the festival [*i. e.*, at the end of verse 37,] and כְּמִשְׁפָּט in connection with the seventh day [*i. e.*, at the end of verse 33].[39] Now Tassafoth criticises Rashi, and these are the words of Tossafoth: "We read כְּמִשְׁפָּטָם on the seventh day, as is evident from *Taamith*, 4 *b*, and from the Massorah magna, and not as Rashi, who reads on the eighth day." Thus far the remark of Tossafoth.

Moreover, in *Menachoth*, 34 *b*, Rashi, of blessed memory, does not animadvert upon the Talmud, which reads differently from the correct Codices, as he animadverted in connection with the sons of Eli [*vide supra*, p. 20], and yet these are the words of *Menachoth:* "The sages propound, 'Rabbi Ishmael said in לְטֹטָפֹת לְטֹטָפֹת לְטוֹטָפֹת, the four compartments [in the phylactery] are indicated."[40] Thus far the words of the Talmud. In the Correct codices, however, as well as in the Book of the Crowns,[41] the reading is as follows, לְטֹטָפֹת

---

[38] These words also occur in connection with the other days of the feast, but without the letters in question; and as, according to the Talmudic laws of exegesis, no superfluous letter is ever used in the Bible without its having a recondite meaning (compare Ginsburg's *Commentary on Ecclesiastes*, p. 30, &c., Longman, 1861); these three letters have been combined into מים, *water*. This exegetical rule, which is called גורעין ומוספין ודורשין, *letters taken from one word and joined to another, or formed into new words*, will be found in Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, *s. v.* MIDRASH, p. 172, rule iii.

[39] The passage must have been altered since the day of the Tossafoth, and made conformable to the present text of the Bible, as in my copy of the Talmud there is no difference between Rashi and the Massoretic text.

[40] The word טטפת occurs only three times (Exod. xiii. 16; Deut. vi. 8, xi. 18); in two instances it has no ו (Deut. vi. 8, xi. 18), and in the third (Exod. xiii. 16), there is a ו after the first ט, *i. e.*, טוטפת; hence R. Ishmael regards it as a dual, and makes of the three words *four*, to obtain the four compartments in the phylacteries. As the limits of a note do not permit of a detailed description of these compartments, we must refer to Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, art. PHYLACTERIES, for it.

[41] The Book of Crowns (ספר תגי) to which Jacob b. Chajim refers, is an ancient treatise, containing Massoretical rules on the ornamental letters. It has only just been published, for the first time, by Burges, Paris, 1866. The passage in question is to be

reply.] Whereupon it was asked, Where is this remark of Rabbi Meier? [Reply.] We find that a house which has a door with only one post, Rabbi Meier says it ought to have *a Mezuzah*, but the sages say it ought not. [Query.] What is the reason of the sages? [Reply.] Because the text has מְזֻזוֹת in the plural [thus shewing that two posts were required]. [Query.] And what is the reason of Rabbi Meier? [Reply.] For we learn that it is מְזֻזוֹת *plural*, whence I see that it cannot be less than two; and when מְזֻזוֹת is again mentioned in another verse, where it is superfluous, it is to teach us that it comes within the exegetical rule, *inclusion after inclusion;* and every *inclusion after inclusion* is meant for *diminution;* hence we must have *a Mezuzah* when there is only one post to the door.[37]

מאיר, ושיילינן עלה מאי רבי מאיר, דתניא בית שאין לו אלא פצים אחד רבי מאיר מחייב במזוזה וחכמים פוטרים, מאי טעמא דרבנן, מזוזות כתיב, מאי טעמא דרבי מאיר, דתניא מזוזות, שומע אני מיעוט מזוזות שתים, כשהוא אומר מזוזת בפרשה שניה, שאין תלמוד לומר רבוי אחר רבוי, ואין רבוי אלא למעט מעטו הכתוב למזוזה אחת[37] דברי רבי ישמעאל וכולי עכ׳ל הגמרא שם: ואף על גב דהוה משמע קצת דכתיב מזוזות מלא בשני ווין ולא מזוזת חסר, דהא רבי ישמעאל אית ליה יש אם למסורת, פירוש לדרוש על פי הכתב, כדגרסינן בריש סנהדרין גבי לטטפת, מיהו אין ראיה מזה, דהכי נמי אשכחן רבי עקיבא דאית ליה יש אם למקרא פירוש לדרוש כפי הדבור הקרוי כההיא דלטטפת, ובפרק כל שעה אית ליה יש אם למסרה תוספת עד כאן:

ותו בפרק הבונה הקשו התוספה על רש׳י זכרונו לברכה גבי הא דתניא רבי יהודה בן בתירא אומר נאמר בשני ונסכיהם, בששי

Thus says Rabbi Ishmael, &c. [upon which Tossafoth remarks]; and accordingly it would appear that the reading is מְזוּזוֹת *plene* with two *Vavs*, and not defective with one *Vav;* and this is the remark of Rabbi Ishmael, who says that the text is of paramount importance, *i. e.*, that we must explain it according to the written text or *the Kethiv*, just as we find in *Sanhedrin*, 4 *b*, in the case of טֹטָפוֹת. But the fact is that we cannot infer anything from this; since we find Rabbi Akiva, who maintains that the marginal reading is of primary consideration, *i. e.*, that we must be guided by *the Keri* as in the case of טֹטָפוֹת, yet he himself admits that text is of paramount importance."

Again, in *Sabbath*, 103 *b*, Tossafoth is at variance with Rashi, of blessed memory, where we find that Rabbi Jehudah b. Bethira says:—"The Scriptures use וְנִסְכֵּיהֶם [Numb. xxix. 19] with regard to the second day of the feast of tabernacles, וּנְסָכֶיהָ [*ibid.*, verse 31] with regard to the sixth day, and כְּמִשְׁפָּטָם [*ibid.*, verse 33] with regard retic conclusions, as we have seen in the above quotation from the *Tract Sabbath* [55 *b*] on the sons of Eli, where he argues from the Massorah against R. Hunna b. Joshua, and concludes that the said passage in the Talmud is spurious, — that he should in various other places entertain opinions contrary to those of the Massorah. Thus, for instance, he writes in his Commentary on Gen. xxv. 6, "The reading is פלגשם without the י, to shew that it was only one concubine *i. e.*, Hagar, who was identical with Keturah, according to the opinion of *Bereshith Rabba*."[35] He also remarks on Numbers vii. 1, that the reading is כלת and not כַּלּוֹת; whereas the Massorah most distinctly remarks פִּילַגְשִׁים is "twice entirely *plene*," viz., in Gen. xxv. 6, and in Esther ii. 9. Thus also the Massorah parva remarks on כַּלּוֹת, Numb. vii. 1, "Not extant, *plene*."

---

[37] To understand the discussion given in the text, it is necessary to remark that, according to the exegetical rules of the ancient Rabbins, the Bible never repeats a word twice without designing to convey thereby a special meaning. Accordingly, if a thing is repeated twice, and the repetition appears superfluous, it is explained as implying more than one statement would convey. But if the repetition cannot be explained as implying inclusion, it is taken to denote exclusion. This rule is called אין ריבוי אחר ריבוי אלא למעט, *inclusion after inclusion, effecting exclusion.* Comp. Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, *s. v.* MIDRASH, p. 170, rule iv.

חיה בקי במסורה וסבירא ליה כדעת בעלי המסרה, דהא לעיל גבי בני עלי דפרק במה בהמה, הקשה מהמסרה על רב הונא בריה דרב יהושע וכתב, ואומר אני שטעות גדול הוא וכולי, והא אשכחן בכמה דוכתי דסבירא ליה דלא כדעת בעלי חמסרה, גבי ולבני הפילגשים כתב בפירוש החומש פלגשם כתיב חסר יו״ד שלא היתה אלא פלגש אחת, והיא הגר והיא קטורה מלשון בראשית רבה,[35] וכן ויהי ביום כלות משה כלת כתיב עד כאן. ובהדיא במסרה כתיב הפילגשים ב׳ מלא דמלאים, דין ועל יד הגי שומר הפילגשים, וכן ביום כלות משה כתוב במסורת הקטנה לית מלא:

ותו אשכחן דפירש בפירוש החומש בפרשת ואתחנן מזוזות ביתיך מזוזת כתיב, שאין צריך אלא אחת,[36] ותימא דבמסורת הוא כתיב מלא בוי״ו בין זיי״ן לתי״ו, ורש״י זכרונו לברכה סבר לה כרבי מאיר במנחות פרק הקומץ את המנחה, גבי הא דגרסינן רב פפא איקלע לבי מר שמואל, חזא חהוא פיתחא דלא הוח ליה פצימיא אלא משמאלא ועבידה ליה מזוזה, אמר ליה כמאן, כרבי

And again Rashi remarks, in his Commentary on the Pentateuch, the reading is מְזֻזַת [Deut. vi. 9] in order to shew that even if a door has only one post, it requires *a Mezuzah*.[36] Now I wonder at this, for we find in the Massorah that it is written with a ו between the ז and the ת. Rashi, of blessed memory, however, adopts the opinion of Rabbi Meier in *Menachoth*, 34 *a*, where we learn, "R. Papa, happening to call at the house of Mar Samuel, saw there a door which had only one post on the left side, and yet had *a Mezuzah*, and asked, According to whom is this? According to Rabbi Meier [was the understand how this sage is here cited, for I am of opinion that the whole passage is spurious, and that he never said it, since the reading of the most trustworthy Codices is מַעֲבִרִים *plene*, and since it is not mentioned in the great Massorah, where all the words in which the *Jod* is in *the Kethiv* but not in the *Keri* are numbered and rubricated. Besides, the whole question is irrelevant, as the meaning of מַעֲבִרִים is not *to transgress*, but *to circulate a report;* and this is what Eli said, '*No, my son, it is not a good report which I hear the people of God circulate about you* [1 Sam. ii 24];' מַעֲבִרִים is the plural, and refers to עַם יְהוָֹה, *the people of Jehovah*, and not to the sons of Eli, who were the transgressors themslves, and did make others to transgress." Thus far his language.

---

[35] *Bereshith Rabba* is that part of the *Midrash Rabba* which treats on *Bereshith*, or on the Book of Genesis. For an account of this *Midrash*, we must refer to Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, *s. v.* MIDRASH.

[36] מזוזה with the Jews denotes the piece of parchment on which is written Deut. vi. 4–9; xi. 13–21, which they regard as containing the injunction to inscribe on the door-posts the words of the law. This slip of vellum thus written upon is then enclosed in a cylindrical tube of lead, cane, or wood, and to the present day is nailed to the right door-post of every door. A detailed description of this institution is given by Maimonides, *Jad Ha-Chezaka*, *Hilchoth Mezuzah*, vol. i., p. 93, etc., ed. Immanuel Athias, Amsterdam, 1702; Joreh Deah, §§ 285–292; and in Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, *s. v.* MEZUZAH.

Tossafoth again comments thus upon the passage; and this is its language: "Our Talmud differs from our copies of the Bible, which read מַעֲבִרִים, and we find a similar difference in the *Jerusalem Talmud* on Samson, where it has, 'And he judged Israel *forty* years;' and submits it is evident that the Philistines feared him [*i. e.*, Samson] twenty years after his death, as well as twenty years during his life-time," whereas our copies of the Bible read *twenty* years [Judges xvi. 31]. Thus far its language.

To me it appears, however, that there is no difficulty in it; for what the Talmud speaks about Samson refers to the Midrashic interpretation, viz., "Why is the verse, that he judged Israel twenty years, repeated twice? R. Acha answered, From this we see that the Philistines feared him [*i. e.*, Samson] twenty years after his death, just as they did twenty years before it, and this makes forty years." Hence the Talmud does not say, Why is it written in the text, "he judged Israel forty years?" but simply, "he judged forty years," that is, according to the Midrash. And now everything comes out right when thou lookest into it. Thus far.

Now I wonder at Rashi,—who was versed in the Massorah and Masso-

בעיני שם החכם הנזכר כאן, כי אומר אני שמעות גדול הוא ולא גלה להא מלתא, שהדי בספרים מוגהים כתוב מעברים מלא, וגם במסורת הגדולה במקום שמנויין שם כל התיבות שכתוב בהן יו'ד דלא קרינן לא נמנה זה והם מנויין על פי החשבון וזו אינה קשיא, דהאי מעברים לאו לשון עבירה הוא אלא לשון ויעבירו קול במחנה, והכי קאמר להו עלי, לא טובה השמועה אשר אנכי שומע את עם יי מעבירין ומכריזין וקובלין עליכם, והאי מעברים לשון רבים הוא, ואעם יי קאי ולא אבני עלי, שהרי הם היו עוברים ולא היו מעבירים את אחרים, עד כאן לשונו:

וכתבו התוספות על זה וז'ל, התלמוד שלנו חולק על ספרים שלנו שכתוב בהם מעבירים, וכן מצינו בירושלמי בשמשון והוא שפט את ישראל ארבעים שנה, מלמד שהיו פלשתים יראים ממנו עשרים שנה אחר מותו כמו בחייו, ובכל הספרים שלנו כתוב עשרים שנה, עד כאן לשון התוספות:

ולי נראה דלא קשה מידי הא דשמשון משמע כבדרש, למה נאמר שני פעמים כי שפט את ישראל עשרים שנה, אמר רב אחא מלמר שהיו פלשתים יראים ממנו עשרים שנה אחר מותו ועשרים אחר חייו והיינו ארבעים בתרי זימני, דתלמודא לא אמר מאי דכתיב והוא שפט את ישראל ארבעים שנה, אלא והוא שפט את ישראל ארבעים שנה דמשמע כבדרש, והשתא אתי שפיר ודוק, עד כאן:

ותמיהא לי על רש'י זכרונו לברכה, דהא

כתב על ירמיה בזרות הלשון, כמו באות נפשו שאפה רוח שקרי מבהוץ נפשה, שכך נראה מטבע הלשון, והדבר סוד מסודות התורה בסוד היבום, והמשכיל יבין:

נקטינן מכולהו הני פרכי וכהוותן דכל מילי דקריין ולא כתבן, וכתבן ולא קריין, וכולהו דרכי דמסרה, כולהו הלכה למשה מסיני, ודלא כאשר כתבו החכמים האלה דלעיל, כדגרסינן מהגמרא דנדרים דבפרק אין בין המודר דאייתינן לעיל:

ומיהו אשכחנא בכמה דוכתי דתלמודא חולק על המסורת, כדאשכחן במסכת נדה פרק בנות כותים גבי משכב תחתון ועליון, גבי והנושא אותם יכבס בגדיו ורחץ בשרו במים, והנשא כתיב חסר ויו:

והקשו התוספת[34] שם, תימה דבמסורת הוא מלא, ותירצו ומיהו מצינו שהתלמוד חולק על המסורת, כדאשכחן במסכת שבת פרק במה בהמה גבי בני עלי מעבירם כתיב, וזה לשון הגמרא שם, והכתיב מעבירים, אמר רב הונה בריה דרב יהושע מעבירם כתיב, עד כאן:

ונתקשה לרש״י זכרונו לברכה וז״ל, קשה

lous expressions in נַפְשׁוֹ, *his soul* [Jerem. ii. 24], *the Keri* in the margin being נַפְשָׁהּ, *her soul*, fem., as is evident from the usage of the language. Whereas in fact this is one of the mysteries of the law connected with the Levirate law, and the initiated know it.

Thus we learn from these and similar arguments that *the Keri velo Kethiv*, *the Kethiv velo Keri*, and all the Massoretic statements, are a law of Moses from Sinai, and not as the afore-mentioned sages propound, which is evident from the Talmud [*Nedarim* 37 *b*] quoted above.

We do indeed find that the Talmud differs in many places from the Massorah, as we see in the *Tract Nidda* [33 *a*], where וְהַנּוֹשֵׂא, *and he that beareth* [Levit. xv.. 10], is written והנשא, without *Vav*.

Tossafoth[34] thereupon remarks, "It is strange that the reading of the Massorah is *plene;*" and concludes that the Talmud in fact does sometimes differ from the Massorah, as we find in *Sabbath* [55 *b*] on *the sons of Eli*, where מַעֲבִרִים [1 Sam. ii. 24] is quoted. And this is the remark of the Talmud: [query] "Is not the reading מַעֲבִרִים? Whereupon R. Hunnah b. R. Joshua said the reading is מעברם."

Now Rashi of blessed memory remarks on this passage, "I cannot

---

[34] *Tossafoth* תוספות denotes those *additions* or *supplementary glosses* to Rashi's *Commentary on the Talmud* which are found along with the commentary of Rashi in every edition of the Talmud. The disciples of Rashi, finding that the expositions of their master might be extended and improved, set about to continue his work of exposition immediately after his death, filling up every gap, and using up every scrap which their immortal teacher left. Their reverence for him, however, was so great, that they would not put down their opinions in an independent manner, but denominated them תוספות *additions*, and hence they derived the name *Tossafists*. The first Tossafists consisted chiefly of Rashi's own relations, his two sons-in-law, R. Meier b. Samuel and R. Jehudah b. Nathan, called by way of abbreviation *Riban* (רבי יהודה בן נתן=ריב״ן), his three grandsons, R. Isaac, R. Samuel, and R. Jacob Tam, sons of R. Meier, who are respectively called from their initials *Ribam* (רבי יצחק בן מאיר=ריב״ם), *Rashbam* (רבי שמואל בן מאיר=רשב״ם), and *R. Tam*, and lastly R. Isaac ben Asher of Speier, called *Riba* (רבי יצחק בן אשר=ריב״א), also a relative of Rashi's. Comp. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vol. vi., p. 170, etc., Leipzig, 1861; and vol. vii., p. 129, etc., Leipzig, 1863.

Thers is then no more difficulty in the Don's, of blessed memory, remark, which is as follows: "there is no doubt that they [*i. e.*, Ezra and his associates] have received [*i. e.*, *the Keri*] from the prophets and sages of by-gone days." Thus far his language. To this I reply; Choose one of two positions. If you say that they received it from the prophets and sages of by-gone days, then this cannot escape one of the two alternatives. Either it [*the Keri*] was a law of Moses from Sinai, and they [the prophets and sages] told him [Ezra] that it [*the Keri*] ought to be so, or they did not tell him that such and such readings were a law of Moses from Sinai. If they have not told him that such and such a reading is a law of Moses from Sinai, then he clearly knew already that it [the marginal reading] ought to be so [is the correct one], since it was received so from the prophets. And if it be so, what then does Abravanel mean by saying that the sacred Scribe was afraid to touch any of the words which were spoken by the Holy Ghost? Moreover, there is another objection [to be urged]. If it be that they have received it from the prophets and sages of by-gone days, why have not the prophets and sages themselves corrected it? We are therefore bound to conclude that *the Keri* and *the Kethiv* are both a law of Moses from Sinai, as we have proved above from the Talmud [*Nedarim* 37, *b.*]

As to what Abravanel said in his first hypothesis, "that the writer, according to the degree of inspiration vouchsafed unto him, conveyed by these anomalous expressions some of the mysteries of the law, and therefore Ezra did not venture to expunge them from the sacred books," this is certainly true; as the great Ramban[33] of blessed memory, the chief of the later Kabbalists, has propounded it, in the Introduction to his Commentary on the Pentateuch *(vide in loco)*. And for this very reason I am all the more astonished at Don Abravanel, of blessed memory, for having left the subject undecided, ascribing in his second hypothesis carelessness to Jeremiah, because of the anoma-

ולא יקשה מידי מה שכתב השר זכרונו לברכה וזח לשונו, ואין ספק שכך קבלו מחנביאים וחכמי הדור שקדמוהו עכ׳ל: אשיב עליו ממה נפשך, מה נפשך שכך קבלו מהנביאים והכמי הדור, לא ימנע מחלוקה, אם שהיה חלכה למשה מסני, וגילו לו שכך צריך להיות; ואם שלא גילו לו שכך הלכה למשה מסני, אם לא גילו לו שכך הלכה למשה מסני, אם כן היה יודע בבירור שכך צריך להיות, שכך קבלו מהנביאים, אם כן מאי קאמר במה שאמר כי ירא חסופר הקדוש לשלוח ידו בדברי המדברים ברוח הקדש: ותו קא קשה, אם כן הוא שכך קבלו מחנביאים וחכמי חדור, למה לא תיקנו הם דהינו מהנביאים והכמי הדור, אלא על כרחין דבין הקרי ובין הכתיב כולחו הלכה למשה מסיני, כדאוכחנא לעיל מחהיא דפרק אין בין המודר:

ומה שאמר בסבה הראשונה, אם שכיון הכותב בדברים הזרים ההם סור מן הסודות מסתרי חתורה כפי מעלת נבואתו, ולכן לא מלאה ידו לגשת למחוק וכולי עכ׳ל, כך יש לנו להאמין בודאי כמו שהניח הרב הגדול הרמב׳ן[33] זכרונו לברכה, ראש המקובלים האחרונים בחקדמתו לביאורו לפירוש ההומש עיין שם, ותמהני על השר זכרונו לברכה, כיצר הניח הדבר בספק שאחד כך בסבה השנית

---

[33] For Ramban, or Nachmanides, see above, p. 39.

the textual reading, which was written by the finger of God? We are therefore bound to believe that all of them are a law of Moses from Sinai. Now the same question was put to Rashba of blessed memory, "How can we read בַּטְּחוֹרִים instead of בָּעֳפוֹלִים, and יִשְׁכָּבֶנָּה instead of יִשְׁגָּלֶנָּה, which are not in the text?" When Rashba, of blessed memory, answered as follows:—

"As regards thy question, 'Seeing that in reading the law one must not change even a single letter, how can the Prelector read יִשְׁכָּבֶנָּה when the text has יִשְׁגָּלֶנָּה, or substitute another reading in any other passage for what is in the text, seeing that all *the Kethivs* in the law are according to the Massorah, and not according to *the Keri?*'

"The answer is, that it is the law of Moses from Sinai, as it is written in *Tract Nedarim* [37 *b*], 'the pronunciation of certain words according to the Scribes, the removal of *Vav* by the Scribes, *the Kethiv velo Keri*, and *the Keri velo Kethiv*, &c., are all a law of Moses from Sinai.'" Thus far his language. From this it is evident that the interrogator did not know that it was a law of Moses from Sinai, since Rashba, of blessed memory, informed him that it was so; and now, seeing that it is a law of Moses from Sinai, there can be no more any question about it. See, moreover, that even Rashba, of blessed memory, supported himself therein on the above quotation from *Nedarim*, in spite of there being a great many more *Keris* and *Kethivs* than those enumerated in the Talmud, as already stated before. If these were doubtful readings, as Kimchi, of blessed memory, and Ephodi maintain, why were they not enumerated with the three instances of doubtful readings in *Sopherim* [vi. 4]? Seeing, then, that there are no more than three, it is evident that the others were not doubtful, for if they were doubtful they [the Sopherim] would in these, as in the former instances, have followed the majority of MSS., and not have put them in the margin, as we have stated above.

כתוב באצבע אלהים, אלא על כרחין אית לן למימר שכלם הלכה למשה מסני, ונשאלה שאלה זו להרשב׳א זכרונו לברכה, היאך נקרא שלא מן הכתב בעפולים בטחורים, ישגלנה ישכבנה, ותירץ הרשב׳א זכרונו לברכה וזה לשונו:

וששאלת כיון שאסור לקרות בתורה אפילו אות אחת שלא מן חכתב, היאך שליח צבור קורא ישכבנה והוא כתוב ישגלנח, וכן בכל תיבה שיש בה קרי וכתיב, שכולם כתובים בתודה כפי המסורת ולא כפי חקרי:

תשובה זו הלכה למשה מסני, וכמו שכתוב בנדרים פרק אין בין חמודר, מקרא סופרים, ועטור סופרים, כתבן ולא קריין כולן הלכה למשה מסני עכ׳ל: מהתשובה איכא למידק דהשואל לא היה ידע דאינון הלכה למשה מסני, מדקחזינן דהרשב׳א זכרונו לברכה השיב זו הלכה למשה מסני וכולי: ומאחר ראינון חלכה למשה מסני תו ליכא לאקשויי מידי: וראה שגם הרשב׳א זכרונו לכרכה נסתייע מההיא דפרק אין בין המודר, ואף על פי שבאו בתורה כמה וכמה קרי וכתיב זולת מה רמייתי בגמרא כדפרכינן לעיל, ואם היו ספקות כדפירש הקמחי זכרונו לברכה והאפודי, היאך לא מני לון בהדי חנך דמסכת סופרים, ומדקחזינן דלא מני ולא קחשיב אלא שלש, אם כן שארא כולהו לא חוו ספיקי, ואם איתא דהוו ספיקי הוה אזל בהו בתר רובא, כדאזלי בהנך רמסכת סופרים, ולא הוה תולה מבחוץ כדתרצינן לעיל:

איתא להא ראמר השר האברבנאל, שלכן לא
מלאה ידו דעזרא לגשת למחוק דבר מספרי
האלהים, כי חבין בדעתו שבחכמה נכתבו,
לא ימנע מחלוקה, אם שהיה יודע שהם הלכה
למשה מסני, ואם שהיו ספקות כדפירש הקמחי
זכרונו לברכה והאפודי: ואם תאמר שלא
היה יודע שהם הלכה למשה מסני, למה לא
מחק והלך אחר הרוב, דהא הזינן דבשלשה
ספרים שנמצאו בעזרה הלכו אחר הרוב, ואם
תאמר כלם היו שוים ולכן נמנע מלגשת
למחוק ועשה הקרי מבחוץ, אם כן יורני כיצר
נקרא בספר תורה שאסור לקרות אפילו אות
אחת שלא מן הכתב, היעלה על לב שנקרא
הקרי שתקן עזרא הסופר שהוא פירוש הכתוב
הזר לדעתו זכרונו לברכה, ונניח הכתב שהוא

be any foundation in what Don Abravanel said, that the reason why Ezra did not venture to omit anything from the books of God is, that he considered them to be written by Divine wisdom, this cannot escape one of two alternatives: either Ezra knew that they were all the law of Moses from Mount Sinai, or that they were doubtful readings, as Kimchi, of blessed memory, and Ephodi maintained. And if you say that he did not know whether they were the law of Moses from Mount Sinai, why did he not expunge the reading of the one copy, and adopt that of the majority of codices, seeing that, in the case of the three codices found in the court of the temple, they followed the majority of copies? But you will perhaps argue that the MSS. were equally divided, and that he could therefore omit nothing, but was obliged to put *the Keri* in the margin. Then let such an one shew me how it is possible to read the Pentateuch, when [according to the Talmud] we must not read a single letter which is not written in the text. How then can it enter into one's mind that we should read *the Keri*, which, according to the opinion of Abravanel, of blessed memory, Ezra the Scribe put down to explain the anomalous text, and leave out

---

codex, again, there were only nine passages which had היא *written with a* Iod [as it is generally written הוא with a Vav], *whereas the other two had eleven passages; the readings of the two were declared valid, and those of the one invalid.* These eleven instances, which are given in *Abboth de Rabbi Nathan* (cap. xxxiv.) and in the Massorah magna on Gen. xxxviii. 25, are as follows: Gen. xiv. 2, xx. 5, xxxviii. 25; Lev. ii. 15, xi. 39, xiii. 10, 21, xvi. 31, xxi. 9; Numb. v. 13, 14. It must be borne in mind that in all other instances הוא with *Vav* retains its archaic and epicene character throughout the Pentateuch, and is used for both the masculine and the feminine. When the text of the Hebrew Scriptures was afterwards subjected to a critical revision, according to grammatical rules laid down by the Scribes, הוא was changed into היא throughout the Prophets and the Hagiographa, wherever it referred to the feminine gender; and the few cases in which הוא is still left, or in which the newly introduced היא refers to the masculine gender, are noted by the Massorah as *Keri* and *Kethiv*. Thus the Massorah on Ps. lxxiii. 16, gives *five* instances in which the textual reading is היא with *Iod*, when referring to the masculine gender; whilst the emended marginal reading is הוא (viz., 1 Kings xvii. 15; Ps. lxxiii. 16; Job xxxi. 11; Eccles. v. 9; 1 Chron. xxix. 16), and, *vice versa*, three instances in which the textual reading has הוא, when referring to the feminine gender (viz., 1 Kings xvii. 15; Isa. xxx. 33; Job xxxi. 11), whilst the marginal emendation has היא. These are also marked in the margin of the ordinary editions of the Hebrew Bible, as *Keri* and *Kethiv*, and *Kethiv* and *Keri*.

codices [of the Pentateuch] were found in the court of the temple,[29] one of which had the reading מְעוֹן, the other וַעֲטוּטֵי, and the third differed in the number of passages wherein היא is read with a *Iod*. Thus in the one codex it was written מְעוֹן, *dwelling* [Deut. xxxiii. 27], whilst the other two codices had מְעוֹנָה; the reading of the two was therefore declared valid, whereas that of the one was invalid.[30] In the second codex, again, וַעֲטוּטֵי was found [in Ex. xxiv. 11], whilst the other two codices had אֲצִילֵי:[31] the reading in which the two codices agreed was declared valid, and that of the one invalid."[32] Now if there

ספרים נמצאו בעזרה,[29] ספר מעון, ספר זעטוטי, וספר היא, באחד מצאו כתוב מעון אלהי קדם ובשנים מצאו כתוב מעונה אלהי קדם, וקיימו שנים ובטלו אחד,[30] באחד מצאו כתוב ואל זעטוטי בני ישראל לא שלח ידו, ובשנים מצאו כתוב ואל אצילי[31] בני ישראל לא שלח ידו, וקיימו שנים ובטלו אחד, עד כאן:[32] ואם

---

[29] In the court of the temple those codices of the Law were kept which were used for reading the lessons for the Sabbaths and festivals.

[30] This variation affects the final ה, the insertion or omission of which was left to the taste of the individual scribes, and depended upon the different localities. This is evident, from the remark in the Talmud (אנשי ירושלים היו כותבין ירושלימה ולא היו מקפידין ודכותה צפון צפונה תימן תימנה), that the inhabitants of Jerusalem omitted it in one word and appended it in another, according to pleasure (*Jerusalem Megilla* i. 11, p. 71 *b*, ed. Graetz), as well as from the omissions and insertions of ה exhibited in the *Keri* and *Kethiv* in the Talmud (*Sopherim* vii. 2); and in the Massorah finalis under letter ה (comp. also Massorah magna on Exod. iv. 19; xix. 22). It was afterwards, when uniformity in orthography was found desirable, that R. Ishmael and R. Nehemiah laid it down as a rule, that *direction to*, *motion towards*, should be indicated by an appended ה if the word has not the prefix ל (*Jebamoth* 13 *b*). The Samaritans, however, would not submit to this revision and criticism of the text, and retained the old corruptions, for which reason they are upbraided by R. Eliezer, who tells us (נומיתי לסופרי כותים מי גרם לכם לטעות דלית אתון דרשין כרבי נחמיה דתני בשם ר נחמיה כל דבר שהוא צריך למ׳ד מתחילתו ולא ניתן לו ניתן לו ה׳א בסופו כגון לחוץ חוצה לשעיר שעירה לסוכות סוכותה), I said to the Samaritan Scribes, What is the use of your error in not adopting the rule of R. Nehemiah? For it is propounded in the name of R. Nehemiah: Every word which ought to have a prefixed ל [to indicate its motion towords] and which has it not, is to have ה at the end; as, for instance, חוצה instead of לחוץ, שעירה instead of לשעיר, סוכותה instead of לסוכות (*Jerusalem Jebamoth* i. 6, p. 3*a*, ed. Graetz.)

[31] There is evidently a mistake in Jacob b. Chajim's quotation, since the variation recorded in the Talmud is not in the reading of ואל אצילי (Exod. xxiv. 11), but of את נערי (Exod. xxiv. 5). The erudite Geiger has no doubt that זעטוטי is the Greek ζητητής, *seeker*, *enquirer*, as the verb ζητέω is frequently used in the Apocrypha for one *who seeks God*, *who searches after wisdom*; and that this variation is not owing to an oversight, but is intentional, since it was not thought becoming to say that at this great revelation *boys* or *youths* (נערים) were brought as sacrifices. Hence they substituted זעטוטי, *worthy searchers after wisdom*, which is countenanced by the fact that the Mishna (*Sebachim* xiv. 4), the Gemara (*ibid.*, 115 *b*), and the Chaldee paraphrases, render נערי by *first-born*. (Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel.* Breslau, 1857, p. 243.)

[32] Jacob b. Chajim does not finish the quotation from the Talmud giving the examples of the third variation found in the third codex, which is as follows: באחד מצאו כתוב תשע היא ובשנים מצאו כתוב אחד עשר היא וקיימו שנים וביטלו אחד, *in the third*

eighty-one errors should occur in the Book of Jeremiah, and one hundred and thirty-three in the Book of Samuel, which he, of blessed memory, himself has counted, and has shewn was written by Jeremiah? Can we entertain the idea that a prophet, of whom it is said, "Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations" [Jer. i. 5], should have fallen into such errors? In conclusion, it appears that the Don, of blessed memory, had not seen the Talmud on this subject; for, according to the Talmud, there is neither light nor any glimpse of light in what he submits. It may, however, be that the Don, of blessed memory, entertained this strange opinion, not because he was unacquainted with the Talmud, but because he followed in this respect the steps of the great Rabbi, Maimonides,[28] of blessed memory, in the *More Nebuchim*, wishing to shew his ability to account for it without the Talmud.

If an objector should urge, "Behold we do not find in the Talmud any more *Keris* and *Kethivs*, *Kethivs velo Keris*, removal of *Vav* by the Scribes, etc., besides those enumerated above, whereas the Massorah gives those and a great many others, I am therefore compelled to tell thee, that in the last-mentioned cases I am obliged to account for them in the manner of Abravanel, of blessed memory; since I believe that those only which are mentioned in the Talmud are the law of Moses from Mount Sinai, but not the others."

Now though it is true that the Massorah does indeed count all those which are mentioned in the Tract Sopher'm, and a great many more, yet this presents no insurmountable difficulty. For we learn, in the Mishna *Sopherim*, vi. 4, "R. Simon b. Lakish says three

בספר ירמיה אחד ושמונים פעמים, ובספר שמואל שכתבו ירמיה, כמו שהוכיח הוא זכרונו לברכה, רבו בו הקרי והכתיב בכמו מאה ושלשים ושלש, כמו שמנא הוא זכרונו לברכה, היעלה על לב, נביא שנאמר עליו, בטרם אצרך בבטן ידעתיך, ובטרם תצא מרחם הקדשתיך, נביא לגוים נתתיך, יפול בשגגות כאלה, סוף דבר נראה הס ושלום כאלו השר זכרונו לברכה לא ראה הגמרא, ואליבא דגמרא לא נהיר ולא צהיר מה דתירץ, ואולי כי השר זכרונו לברכה היתה רוה אחרת עמו, ולא נעלם ממנו ח'ו הגמרא, כי דרך בדרך הרב הגדול הרמב'ם[28] זכרונו לברכה במורה הנבוכים, להראות כחו, כי זולת הגמרא יש דרך לתרץ:

ואם יקשה המקשה, הא לא אשכחנא בגמרא מקריין וכתבן וכתבן ולא קריין ועטור סופרים וכולי, אלא מה דחשיב בגמרא, ובמסרה חשיב כל הני וטפי עליהו כמה וכמה, ולעולם אימא לך דבשארא בעי לתרוצי בדתירץ השר האברבנאל זכרונו לברכה, דסלקא דעתך למימר הני דקחש'ב בגמרא כולהו הלכה למשה מסיני, ובשארא לא:

ואברא דבמסרה חשיב כל הני וטפי עליהו וטפי ממה דמייתי במסכת סופרים, אבל לא קשה מידי, דגרסינן במסכת סופרים פרק ששי, אמר רבי שמעון בן לקיש שלשה

---

[28] *Rambam* רמב"ם, is a contraction of the initials of ר' משה בן מימון, *R. Moses ben Maimon*, also called *Maimonides*, one of the most extraordinary Jewish philosophers who have lived since the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. He was born March 30, 1135, in Cordova, and died December 13, 1204. His religio-philosophical work, entitled *More Nebuchim*, has recently been published by Munk, Paris, 1856–1866.

This statement is not correct, since we are distinctly told in the Talmud: "Our sages submit, All the verses wherein are written indecent expressions, decent expressions are read in their stead, *e. g.*, שָׁכַב instead of שָׁגַל [Deuteronomy xxviii. 30; Isa. xiii. 16; Jer. iii. 2; Zech. xiv. 2]; טְחֹרִים instead of עֳפָלִים [Deut. xxviii. 27; 1 Sam. v. 6. 9. 12.; vi. 4. 5]; דִּבְיוֹנִים instead of חֲרֵיוֹנִים [2 Kings vi. 25]; צוֹאָתָם instead of חֲרֵיהֶם [2 Kings xviii. 27; Isa. xxxvi. 12]; רַגְלֵיהֶם instead of שֵׁינֵיהֶם [2 Kings xviii. 27; Isa. xxxvi. 12]; לְמוֹצָאוֹת instead of לְמַחֲרָאוֹת [2 Kings x. 27]."[27] And Rashi, of blessed memory, submits that the expression שָׁגַל is used for illegitimate cohabitation like that of dogs, as it is written in Nehemiah [ii. 6], where שָׁגַל is used in this sense. *The Aruch*, too, explains it in like manner under the words דביון, whereas שָׁכַב denotes the cohabitation of people who are legally married. Hence we see that it is not as Abravanel maintains; that טְחֹרִים did not originate from our ignorance of the word עֳפָלִים, and that שָׁגַל is not used in connection with a queen. Compare *Rosh Ha-Shana*, 4 *a*.

וליתא לדבריו דהא בהדיא גרסינן סוף פרק הקורא את המגילה עומד, תנו רבנן כל המקראות הכתובין בתורה לגנאי קורין אותן לשבח, כגון ישלגנה ישכבנה, בעפולים בטחורים, חריונים דביונים, לאכול את חוריהם, ולשתות את מימי שיניהם, לאכול את צואתם, ולשתות את מימי רגליהם, למחראות למוצאות, עד כאן:[27] ופירש רש״ זכרונו לברכה ישגלנה לשון כלבא, כדכתיב והשגל יושבת אצלו כלבתא, וכן פירש בערוך בערך דביון ישגלנה משמע בזנות ככלבא, כמו והשגל יושבת אצלו ישכבנה משמע דרך אישות בקדושין ובהופה, עד כאן לשונו: אם כן אינו לפי שלא ידענו מה הם הגבוהים ה.ם, וגם שם שגל לא נאמר על המלכה, ועיין בפרק קמא דראש השנה:

ולא אשיב על דברי השר האברבנאל בסבה השנית, באומרו כי המלות נכתבו כן בזרותם לסבה מן הסבות, אם להיות האומר אותם בלתי מדקדק כראוי, אם בקצור ידיעת הלשון העברי, ואם בקצור ידיעת דקרוק הכתיבה, כי תמהני עליו אם דבר זה יצא מפי אדם דוגמתו זכרונו לברכה, היעלה על דעת כי הנביאים קצרה ידם בכל אלה, אם כן הוא זכרונו לברכה היה גדול מהם בדקדוק הלשון העברית, וחיי ראשי כי לא אאמין דבר זה, ואם היה בשגגה כמו שכתב הוא זכרונו לברכה, למה הנביא או המדבר ברוח הקדש לא תקנו, האם השגגה נפלה

I am not going to reply to the words of Abravanel in his second hypothesis, viz., "that the anomalous expressions are owing to the deficiency of the writer in his knowledge of Hebrew or orthography," for I am amazed that such a thing should have proceeded from a man like him, of blessed memory. How can any one entertain such an idea in his mind, that the prophets were deficient in such matters? If it really were so, then Abravanel, of blessed memory, had a greater knowledge of Hebrew than they; and for the life of me I cannot believe this. And if they really did inadvertently commit an error, as he, of blessed memory, insinuates, how is it that the prophet or the inspired speaker did not correct it himself? Is it possible that

---

[27] Comp. *Megilla*, 25 *b*.; *Sopherim* ix. 9; *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, sections clxix., clxx., pp. 38, 114; Massorah marginalis on 1 Sam. v. 6, Isaiah xiii. 16; and *supra*. p. 45, note 19.

Jeremiah in connection with the history of Zedekiah [xxxviii. 16].[24] And Rashi,[25] of blessed memory, also says that אֶת הַמִּצְוָה occurs in Jeremiah. As for the removal of *Vav* by the Scribes, see below, in my reply to the heretics.

From this, then, it is evident that the whole of it is a law of Moses from Mount Sinai, and that Ezra the Scribe did not put *the Keri* in the margin to explain ungrammatical phrases; nothing appeared anomalous to Ezra, nor did he meet with any uncertainties and confusions, for the whole of it is the law of Moses from Mount Sinai, as stated above.

הנפש הזאת,[24] ורש"י זכרונו לברכה,[25] פירש את דהמצוה כתיב בירמיה עד כאן: ועטור סופרים עיין לקמן בתשובת המינים:

הא נקיטינן דכולהו הלכה למשה מסיני, ולא שם עזרא הסופר מבחוץ הקרי שהוא פירוש חכתוב הזר, וגם לא היה זר בעיניו חם ושלום, ולא השיגו לא ספק ולא בלבול, כי כלה הלכה למשה מסיני, כדגרסינא לעיל:

ותו קשה בעיני מה שאמר וזה לשונו, וככה כשמצא עזרא שכתוב בתורה ובעפולים שהוא לשון גובה ולא ידענו מה הם הגבוהים חהם, חוצרך לפרש בקרי שהם טחורים, וכן ישגלנה לפי ששם שגל נאמר על המלכה, הוצרך לפרש בקרי ישכבנה, עד כאן לשונו:[26]

Moreover, I object to Abravanel's assertion, that Ezra, finding the word בָּעֳפָלִים, which denotes *heights*, and which conveys no meaning to us, he had to put in the margin the word טְחוֹרִים, *emerods;* and that this is also the case with the word יִשְׁגָּלֶנָּה, the root of which (שגל) is used with regard to a queen, he therefore put in the margin יִשְׁכָּבֶנָּה."[26]

---

[24] We have already remarked that the Massorah gives ten instances of *Keri velo Kethiv*, or *marginal insertions of entire words not to be found in the text;* and eight instances of *Kethiv velo Keri*, or *omissions in the margin of entire words written in the text* (*vide supra*, p. 40). The list of the marginal insertions is as follows:—

בני, *sons of*	Judges xx. 13	צבאות, *Sabaoth* . .	Isaiah xxxvii. 32
פרת, *Euphrates* . . .	2 Sam. viii. 3	באים, *they are coming* .	Jerem. xxxi. 38
איש, *man*	2 Sam. xvi. 21	לה, *to her*	Jerem. l. 29
כן, *thus*	2 Sam. xviii. 20	אלי, *to me*	Ruth iii. 5
בניו, *his sons*	2 Kings xix. 37	אלי, *to me*	Ruth iii. 17

This list is to be found in the Massorah marginalis on Deut. i. 1; and on Ruth iii. 17; *Sopherim* vi. 8; *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, section xcvii. The list of the marginal omissions is as follows:—

אם, *if*	2 Sam. xiii. 33	אם, *if*	Jerem. xxxix. 12
אם, *if*	2 Sam. xv. 21	ידרך, *he shall tread* . . .	Jerem. li. 3
נא, *now*	2 Kings v. 18	חמש, *five*	Ezek. iii. 12
את, *accusative sign* .	Jerem. xxxviii. 16	אם, *if*	Ruth iii. 12

This list is given in the Massorah marginalis on Ruth iii. 12; *Sopherim* vi. 9, where, however, six instances only are enumerated, נא, 2 Kings v. 18, and את, Jerem. xxxviii. 16, being omitted; and in the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, section xcviii. Comp. also Levita's *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, p. 109, &c., ed. Ginsburg.

[25] *Rashi* is that celebrated commentator of the Old Testament and the Talmud, who is commonly but erroneously called *Jarchi*. The name *Rashi* רש"י is a contraction of רבי שלמה יצחקי, *Rabbi Solomon Isaki or Itzchaki* = *R. Solomon ben Isaac.* He was born at Troyes, in Champagne, in 1040, where he also died, July 26th, 1105.

[26] *Vide supra*, p. 46.

סופרים וקריין ולא כתיבן, וכתיבן ולא קריין הלכה למשה מסיני; מקרא סופרים ארץ, שמים, מצרים,[22] עטור סופרים אחר תעבורו, אחר תלך, אחר תאסף, קדמו שרים אחר נוגנים, צדקתך כהררי אל;[23] קריין ולא כתיבן פרת דבלכתו, איש דכאשר ישאל איש בדבר האלהים, באים דנבנתה, לה דפליטה, את דהגד הוגד לי, אלי דהגורן, אלי דהשעורים, הלין קריין ולא כתבן; וכתבן ולא קריין נא דיסלה, את דחמצוה, ידרוך דהדורך, חמש דפאת נגב, אם דכי גואל, הלין כתיבן ולא קריין, עד כאן לשון הגמרא; את דהמצוה אית דאמרי דבפרשת ואתחנן ולא היא, דלא נמצא בספרים שלנו וגם בספרי המסרה לא מני ליה, ובמסרה חשיב כל הני וטפי עליהו אחריני מיהו לא חשיב את דהמצוה אלא את דהנפש, דכתיב בירמיהו גבי צדקיהו, חי יי אשר עשה לנו את

velo Kethiv, and *the Kethiv velo Keri*, are laws of Moses from Mount Sinai. The pronunciation of the Scribes shews how to read ארץ, *earth*, שמים, *heaven*, מצרים, *Egypt*;[22] the removal of *Vav* by the Scribes is to be found four times in the case of אַחַר, *afterwards* [Gen. xviii. 5; xxiv. 55; Numb. xxxi. 2; Ps. lxviii. 26], and once by מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ, *thy judgements* [Ps. xxxvi. 7];[23] *the Keri velo Kethiv* is seen in פְּרָת, *Euphrates* [2 Sam. viii. 3]; אִישׁ, *a man* [*Ibid.* xvi. 23]; בָּאִים, *they are coming* [Jer. xxxi. 38]; לָהּ, *to her* [*Ibid.* l. 29]; אֶת, accusative [Ruth ii. 11]; אֵלַי, *unto me* [*Ibid.* iii. 5, 17]; these words are read without being written in the text. *The Kethiv velo Keri* is seen in נָא, *now* [2 Kings v. 18], אֶת, sign of the accusative; יִדְרֹךְ, *he shall bend* [Jerem. li. 3]; חָמֵשׁ, *five* [Ezek. xlviii. 16]; אִם, *if* [Ruth iii. 12]; these words are in the text, but are not read [*Nedarim*, 37 *b*]." Thus far the Talmud. The expression את connected with הַמִּצְוָה, *the commandment*, some say occurs in Deut. v. 31, but it is not true, since it is not found in our copies; nor is it mentioned in the works of the Massorah. The Massorah, indeed, does enumerate all the above-mentioned examples [as given in the Talmud], and even many others, but does not give אֶת connected with הַמִּצְוָה, *the commandment;* it only gives אֶת as connected with הַנֶּפֶשׁ, *the soul*, which is found in

---

[22] That is to say, since there were no vowel points to indicate when it was pronounced אֶרֶץ and when אָרֶץ (in pause), or to shew that שָׁמַיִם and מִצְרַיִם have simply dual forms without being duals, the Sopherim pointed out how these and many other words are to be read.

[23] There is a difference of opinion as to what is meant by עטור סופרים and the examples here adduced to illustrate it. According to Rashi on this passage, it denotes the idiomatic construction fixed by the Sopherim, which necessitates the writing of אחר תעבורו and not תעבורו אחר, and is called עטור because it is an improvement of or ornament to the style. Acording to others, this ornament of style (עיטור סופרים) consists in using the word אחר at all, since it is superfluous in all these instances given in the Talmud, as we could very well say, קדמו שרים נוגנים, תסגר שבעת ימים ותאסף, סעדו לבכם ותעבורו, whilst, according to *the Aruch*, as given below, it is the removal of a superfluous ו which has crept into the text in all these instances through a vitiated provincial pronunciation. The latter is the general opinion of critics as to the meaning of עטור סופרים. Compare Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 251, &c. The instances of the *Itur Sopherim*, quoted from the Talmud (*Nedarim* 37 *b*) are also given in the *Ochlah Ve-Ochlah*, section ccxvii. pp. 46, 128; and in the Massorah marginalis on Psalm xxxvi. 7, which, however, only gives *four* passages, omitting Gen. xxiv. 55.

He, in like manner, counts how many *Keris* and *Kethivs* occur in every book of the Bible, in order to shew which of the prophets was more conversant with the grammar. But all his views on this subject are far from my notions, as I shall presently shew, in refuting him.

The strictures, however, which he made upon Kimchi and Ephodi are good and apposite; and, in refuting his arguments, those of his opponents will be criticised at the same time, since both his decisions and the opinions of Kimchi and Ephodi are mere conjectures, whereas we rely solely upon the Talmud, which we acknowledge; for the heart of its sages was as large as the door of the temple; they are truth, and their words are truth.

Now I submit that Don Abravanel, of blessed memory, is perfectly right in saying that Ezra the Scribe and his associates found the books of the law entire and perfect, just as they were originally written.

But what he says in his first hypothesis, beginning with the words, "Either the writer, according to the degree of inspiration vouchsafed unto him, conveyed by these anomalous expressions some of the mysteries of the law," etc., till "he put *the Keri* in the margin, which simply explains the said anomaly in accordance with the idiom of the language;"[21] all this is not correct, for in the Talmud we learn most distinctly, "R. Ika b. Abaja said in the name of R. Hannael, who repeated it in the name of Rab, What is meant by "and they read in the book, in the law of God, distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading" [Neh. viii. 8]? [Reply.] The words "they read in the book, in the Law of God," mean the Hebrew text; the expression "distinctly" denotes the Targum, "and gave the sense" means the division of the verses, whilst "caused them to understand the reading" signifies, according to some the dividing accents, and according to others the Massorah. R. Isaac said the pronunciation of certain words according to the Scribes, the removal of *Vav* by the Scribes, *the Keri*

וכן הולך ומונה כמה מהקרי וכתיב באו בכל ספר, להורות מי מהנביאים היה יותר בקי בדקדוק הלשון, ותשובותיו רחקו מני, כאשר אבאר ואשיג עליו:

אמנם קשיותיו אשר הקשה על הקמחי והאפודי טובים ונכוחים הם, ובהשיגי והשיבי על תשזבותיו יושגו גם כן הם, כי כל אלו התרוצים ודעת הקמחי והאפודי כולם הם מסברה, ואנן לית לן כי אם תלמודא דילן אשר קבלנו עלינו, כי לבן של ראשונים כפתחו של אולם, והם אמת ודבריהם אמת:

ואומר במה שאמר השר האברבנאל זכרונו לברכה, שעזרא הסופר וסיעתו מצאו ספרי חתורה בשלמותם ותמותם כמו שנכתבו, אמת ויציב דבר:

ואמנם במה שאמר בתירוץ הראשון, אם שכיון הכותב כמו שנכתבו בדברים הזרים ההם וכולי, עד האמנם שם מבחוץ הקרי שהוא פירוש הכתוב הזר ההוא כפי טבע הלשון ליתא לדבריו,[21] דהא בהדיא גרסינן במסכת נדרים פרק אין בין המודר, אמר רב איקא בר אביי אמר רב הננאל אמר רב, מאי דכתיב ויקראו בספר תורת אלהים מפורש ושום שכל ויבינו במקרא, ויקראו בספר תורת אלהים זה מקרא, מפורש זה תרגום, ושום שכל אלו הפסוקים, ויבינו במקרא זה פסק טעמים, ואמרי לה אלו המסורת, אמר רב יצחק מקרא סופרים ועטור

---

[21] *Vide supra*, p. 45, &c.

ובעניינם תמצא כולם שהם מזה המין, שכתבם
ירמיהו כן בטעות ובשגגה וכולי, ותאריך
בהקדמתו שם לספר ירמיה, עד הנה התבאר
שהקרי וכתיב, והקרי ולא כתיב, כולו ענין
הפירוש, וכן הוא הכתיב ולא קרי, שראה עזרא
מלות כתובות שאין להם ענין כפי פשט
הדברים, ולכן לא עשה בהם נקודה כלל ולא
יקרא, ומזה תרע שהספרים אשר נפל בהם
הרבה מזה הוא לחסרון המדבר בידיעת דרכי
הלשון או בידיעת דקדוק הכתיבה, ולכן היו
בספר ירמיה שמונים ואחד מקרי וכתיב, ובספר
שמואל שכתבו ירמיה רבו בו בכמו חקרי
וכתיב בכמו מאה ושלשים ושלש וכלוי, עד
אבל בחורת האלהים להיותה כולה מפי
הגבורה וכמות כתיבתה קרוב לארבע פעמים
ספר ירמיהו לא נמצאו בה מקרי וכתיב אלא
מעט מזער סך הכל[20] וכולי עד כאן לשונו,

them are of this nature, viz., that Jeremiah wrote them through mistakes and carelessness, etc. Abravanel has a great deal more upon this subject in his introduction to Jeremiah: "Hitherto [he says further on] we have shewn that *the Keri* and *the Kethiv*, and *the Keri velo Kethiv*, are simply explanations. This is also the nature of *the Kethiv velo Keri.* When Ezra saw that words were put down in the text which had no meaning according to the simple sense of the words, he did not punctuate them, and therefore they are not to be read. From this you learn that the books, in which there are many such instances, shew that the speaker or writer was deficient in the syntax, or in his knowledge of orthography. Hence you find in Jeremiah alone eighty-one *Keris* and *Kethivs*, and in the books of Samuel, which Jeremiah wrote, the number of *Keris* and *Kethivs* rises to one hundred and thirty-three; . . . whilst in the Pentateuch, which proceeded from the mouth of the Lord, though it is four times as large as the book of Jeremiah, there are comparatively few, only sixty-five *Keris* and *Kethivs.*"[20] Thus far his words.

---

[20] There is a great difference of opinion about the number of these various readings, and the passages in which they occur. As it is impossible to discuss this question in a note of this nature, we subjoin the following table, which is the result of a careful perusal and collation of the Massorah, as printed in the Rabbinic Bible of Jacob b. Chajim, and which exhibits the numbers of *the Keris* and *Kethivs* in each book, according to the order of the Hebrew Bible:—

Genesis	25	Ezekiel	143	Proverbs	70
Exodus	17	Hosea	6	Job	54
Leviticus	6	Joel	1	Song of Songs	5
Numbers	11	Amos	3	Ruth	13
Deuteronomy	23	Obadiah	1	Lamentations	28
Joshua	38	Micah	4	Ecclesiastes	11
Judges	22	Nahum	4	Esther	14
1 Samuel	73	Habakkuk	2	Daniel	129
2 Samuel	99	Zephaniah	1	Ezra	33
1 Kings	49	Haggai	1	Nehemiah	28
2 Kings	80	Zechariah	7	1 Chronicles	41
Isaiah	55	Malachi	1	2 Chronicles	39
Jeremiah	148	Psalms	74	Total	1359

For a further discussion on this subject, we must refer to Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, s. v. KERI AND KETHIV.

Hence he concludes that this must have originated from one of two causes: (1) Either the writer, according to the degree of inspiration vouchsafed unto him, conveys by these anomalous expressions some of the mysteries of the law, and therefore he [Ezra] did not venture to expunge anything from the sacred books. Having thus perceived that it was written by the highest wisdom, and that there is one reason or another why the words are sometimes defective or plene, and why the phrases are anomalous, he left them in the text as they were written, and put *the Keri* in the margin, which simply explains the said anomaly in accordance with the idiom of the language and the design of the narrative; and of this nature are all *the Keris* and *Kethivs* in the Pentateuch. In like manner, when Ezra found the word **בעפולים**, which denotes *heights*, and which conveys no meaning to us, he put in the margin the word **טחורים** *emerods*; and this is also the case with the word **ישגלנה**, the root of which (שגל) is used with regard to a queen; he therefore put in the margin **ישכבנה**. (2) Or Ezra may have been of opinion that these anomalous letters and words are owing to the carelessness of the sacred speaker or writer; and this carelessness on the part of the prophet was like an error which proceeded from a prince. Ezra had therefore to explain such words in harmony with their connection, and this is the origin of *the Keri* which is found in the margin, as this holy Scribe feared to touch the words which were spoken or written by the Holy Ghost. These remarks he made on his own account, in order that he might explain such letters and words, and on that account he put them in the margin, to indicate that this gloss was his own. And there can be no doubt that they [*i. e.*, Ezra and his associates] received the text in such a state from the prophets and the sages who had preceded them. Hence, if you examine the numerous *Keris* and *Kethivs* which occur in Jeremiah, and look into their connection, you will find that all of

הספור, השב בעצמו שהיה זה לאחד משתי סבות, אם שכיון הכותב בדברים הזרים ההם סוד מן הסודות מסתרי התורה כפי מעלת נבואתו, ולכן לא מלאה ידו לגשת למחוק דבר מספרי האלהים, כי הבין בדעתו שבחכמה יתירה נכתבו כן, ושלסבה מן הסבות נכתבו האותיות החסרות והלשונות הזרים, ולכן הניחם בכתב מבפנים כמו שנכתבו, האמנם שם מבחוץ הקרי, שהוא פירוש הכתוב הזר ההוא כפי טבע הלשון ופשיטות הענין, ומזה המין תמצא כל הקרי וכתיב שבתורה, וככה כשמצא עזרא שכתוב בתורה **ובעפולים** שהוא לשון גובה, ולא ידענו מה הם הגבוהים ההם, הוצרך לפרש בקרי שהם **טחורים**. וכן **ישגלנה**, לפי ששם שגל נאמר על המלכה, הוצרך לפרש בקרי **ישכבנה**. גם אפשר שחשב עזרא שהיו בספרי הקדש תיבות ומלות שלא נכתבו כן בזרותם, אלא לסבה מן הסבות אם להיות האומר אותם בלתי מרקדק כראוי אם בקצור ידיעת דקרוק הכתיבה, והיה זה מהנביא כשגגה היוצאת מלפני השליט, ולכן הוצרך לפרש אמתת המלה ההיא כפי הספור, והוא ענין הקרי אשר שם מבחוץ, כי ירא הסופר הקדוש לשלוח ידו בדברי המדברים ברוח הקדש וכתיבתם, ועשה זה בעצמו, רצוני לומר לפרש התיבה והמלה ההיא, ושמו מבחוץ להיותו פירוש שפירש הוא מעצמו, ואין ספק שכך קבלו מהנביאים וחכמי הדור שקדמוהו, והנה רוב הקרי והכתיב שבא בספר ירמיה כשתעיין בם

על דרך מקרה, כפי המקום שנתטשטש או נמצא, ואתה תמצא בספר תורת האלהים בפרשת לך לך[17] שכתוב מלך צביים, והקרי הוא מלך צבאים, וכן כתוב פעם אחרת, האם נפל במקרה הטשטוש והבלבול במלת צביים תמיד, וכן כולם. כמו נערה שכתוב נער עשרים ושנים פעמים[18] במקום אחד מלא, שהוא ונתנו לאבי הנערה,[19] וכן בעפולים, בטחורים, ישגלנה, ישכבנה, אלא שאין הדבר כאשר חשבו החכמים האלה, ושרי להו מריהו:

ותירץ כי אמתת הענין אצלו כי עזרא הסופר וסיעתו מצאו ספרי התורה בשלמותם ותמותם, וקודם שהתעורר לעשות הנקוד והטעמים וסופי פסוקים עיין במקרא, והדברים אשר נראו אליו זרים, כפי טבע הלשון וכוונת

Keri and *the Kethiv*], it ought to occur accidentally in the passage which happened to be obliterated, or in which [a doubtful reading] was found. Whereas thou wilt find in the law of God, in the section *Lech L'Cha* [Gen. xiv. 2],[17] that *Kethiv* is צביים, and *the Keri* is צבאים; and the same thing occurs a second time [*ibid.* verse 8]. Now, could this accidental obliteration always occur in this word צביים? The same is the case with all, *e. g.* נערה, which is written twenty-two times נער,[18] and occurs only once as *plene*, in Deut. xxii. 19; so also בעפולים, which is always *the Keri*, and *the Kethiv* is טחורים, and *the Keri* ישגלנה, whilst *the Kethiv* is always ישכבנה.[19] It is evident, therefore, that the thing is not as these sages thought, and may the Lord forgive them!"

Abravanel, therefore, submits that the true account of the matter is as follows:—"Ezra the Scribe and his associates found the books of the law entire and perfect, but before betaking themselves to make the vowel points, the accents and the division of verses, they examined the text, when they found words which, according to the genius of the language and the design of the narrative, appeared to them irregular.

---

[17] This is the name of one of the Sabbatic lessons, comprising Gen. xii. 1; xvii. 27. According to an ancient custom, the Jews to the present day divide the Pentateuch into *fifty-four* sections, to provide a lesson for each Sabbath of those years which, according to the Jewish chronology, have fifty-four Sabbaths, and thus read through the whole Book of the Law (תרה) in the course of every year. Each of these Sabbath sections, or *sidras* (סידרא), as it is called by the Jews, has a special name, which it derives from the first or second word with which it commences; and Jewish writers, when they quote a passage from the Pentateuch, instead of saying it occurs in such and such a chapter and verse, give, as in the instance before us, the name of the Sabbatic lesson, because this practice obtained prior to the division of the Bible into chapters and verses. A full description of these Sabbatic lessons, as well as of the manners and customs connected therewith, is given in Kitto's *Cyclop.*, art. HAPHTARA.

[18] In the present text we have only twenty-one times נער for נערה, viz., Gen. xxiv. 14, 16, 28, 55, 57; xxxiv. 3 (twice), 12; Deut. xxii. 15 (twice), 16, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26 (twice), 27, 28, 29.

[19] The marginal reading טחורים for the textual בעפולים occurs six times (Deut. xxviii. 27; 1 Sam. v. 6, 9, 12; vi. 4, 5), and ישכבנה for ישגלנה four times (Deut. xxviii. 30; Isa. xiii. 16; Jer. iii. 2; Zech. xiv. 2). The former instances are given in the Massorah marginalis on 1 Sam. v. 6, and *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, section 170; and the latter in the Massorah marginalis on Isaiah xiii. 16, and the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, section 169. Comp. also *Megilla* 25 *b*; *Sopherim* viii. 8; and *infra*, p. 50., &c.

the text, whilst in other places they inserted one reading in the margin and another in the text."[15] Thus far is his language.

Don Isaac Abravanel,[16] the memory of the righteous be blessed, refutes them in his introduction to Jeremiah in this manner, and these are his words:—"The opinion wherein all these wise men agree, and their conclusions, are far from being mine. For how can I believe with my heart, and speak with my lips, that Ezra the scribe found the book of the law of God, and the books of his holy Prophets, in an unsettled state, through obliterations and confusions? Is not the scroll of the law in which one letter is omitted illegal? How much more must it be so through *the Keri* and *the Kethiv*, which are found in the law, since, according to *the Keri*, many letters are wanting in the law," etc.?

Again he says, and these are his words, "Behold, I ask these men if, according to their prevailing opinion, *the Keri* and *the Kethiv* originated because they [Ezra and his associates] found various readings, and Ezra, not being sure which was the right one, put down both readings, one in the margin and the other in the text; if it be so, why should we, in explaining the Scriptures, always follow the *Keri*, and not *the Kethiv?* And why should Ezra, who was himself doubtful, always have put the points in accordance with *the Keri*, and not with *the Kethiv?* And if he meant [to give preference to *the Keri*] he ought to have inserted *the Keri* in the text, as it is the true one and agrees with the points, and put *the Kethiv* in the margin because he did not approve of it.

"Moreover, if the obliterations and confusion to which the books were subject in consequence of the captivity gave rise to it [*i. e.*, *the*

כתבו מבפנים, וכן כתבו בדרך אחר מבחוץ ובדרך אהר מבפנים עד כאן:[15]

והשר דון יצחק אברבנאל זכר צדיק לברכה[16] השיג עליהם בהקדמתו לספר ירמיה וזה לשונו, והדעת הזה אשר הסכימו בו החכמים האלה ועצתם רהקה מני, כי איך אוכל בנפשי לחאמין, ואיך אעלה על שפתי, שמצא עזרא הסופר ספר תורת האלהים וספרי נביאיו מסופקים בהפסד ובלבול, והלא ספר תורה שחסר ממנו אות אחת הוא פסול, כל שכן בקרי וכתיב שבאו בתורה, שכפי הקרי יחסרו בתורה כמה וכמה מהאותיות וכולי:

עוד אמר וזה לשונו, הנה עוד אשאל מאתם כפי הסברה הגוברת, אם היה הקרי וכתיב כפי מה שמצאו בספרים המחולפים, ולא אפשיטא לעזרא הסופר איזה הדרך מהם ישכון אור, ושם שתי הנסחאות אהד מבחוץ ואחד מבפנים, אם כן איפה למה בפירוש הכתובים נסמוך תמיד על הקרי ולא על הכתיב, ולמה עזרא בהיות הרבר אצלו מסופק, עשה הניקוד תמיר מסכים עם חקרי ולא עם הכתיב, ואם היה כן דעתו, היה לו לשום נוסחת הקרי מבפנים, כי היא חאמת והמסכמת עם הנקודה, והכתיב ישים מבחוץ כיון שלא הסכים בה דעתו:

שנית אם היתה סבת זה חפסד ובלבול שנפל בספרים מצד הגלות, היה ראוי שיבא

---

[15] The quotation from Kimchi is from *the Introduction to his Commentary on Joshua.*

[16] Abravanel, or Abarbanel, the famous statesman, philosopher, theologian, and commentator of Spain, was born in Lisbon in 1437, and died at Venice in 1508. For a list of his works on Biblical literature, see Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, *s. v.* ABRAVANEL.

the priest, who was the most accomplished and the chief of the Scribes, bestirred himself, and exerted all his powers to rectify what was wrong; and in like manner acted all the Scribes who followed him. They corrected all the sacred books as much as possible, in consequence of which they have been preserved to us perfect in the numbers of chapters, the verses, the words, letters, plene, defective, the abnormal and normal phrases and the like, and for this reason are denominated Scribes. To this effect they have also composed treatises, which are the books of the Massorah, and made *the Keri* and *Kethiv* in every passage in which they met with some obliterations and confusion, not being sure what the precise reading was." Thus far are his words.

כתב וזה לשונו: השלם ראש הסופרים עזרא הכהן הסופר נער הצנו ושם כל מאמצי כחו לתקן המעוות, וכן עשו כל הסופרים הבאים אחריו, ותקנו הספרים ההם בתכלית מה שאיפשר, עד שהיה זה סבה לחשאירם שלמים במנות הפרשיות והפסוקים והתיבות והאותיות והמלא והחסר והזר והנוהג מנהג הלשון וזולת זה, ולזה נקראו סופרים, ועשו בזה חבורים והם ספרי המסרה, ובמקומות אשר השיגם ההפסד והבלבול עשו הקרי וכתיב, להיותו מסופק במה שמצא, עד כאן לשונו:

והקמחי זכרונו לברכה[14] תמהני על פה קדוש, שדבר מסכים לזה בחקדמתו לנביאים ראשונים וזה לשונו: ונראה כי המלות האלה נמצאו כן, לפי שבגלות הראשונה אבדו הספרים ונטלטלו טלטול, והחכמים יודעי המקרא מתו, ואנשי כנסת הגדולה שהחזירו התורה לישנה, מצאו מחלוקת בספרים, והלכו בהם אחר הרוב לפי דעתם על הבירור, כתבו הא׳ ולא נקדוהו, או כתבו מבחוץ ולא

But what surprises me still more is, that so holy a man as Kimchi[14] should also utter similar things in his introduction to the earlier Prophets. The following is his language: "It appears that these marginal and textual readings originated because the sacred books were lost and scattered about during the Babylonian captivity, and the sages who were skilled in the Scriptures were dead. Whereupon the men of the Great Synagogue, who restored the law to its former state, found different readings in the books, and adopted those which the majority of copies had, because they, according to their opinion, exhibited the true readings. In some places they wrote down one word in the text but did not punctuate it, or noted it in the margin but omitted it from

---

which he especially assumed after 1391, to conceal his real person from the Christians, who at this period of his life compelled him to abjure Judaism, he is also known by the name *Prophiat Duran*. His grammar, entitled *the Grammar of Ephod* (מעשה אפד), to which Jacob Ibn Adonijah refers, has only recently been published for the first time (Vienna, 1865), and the passage in question is to be found in p. 40.

[14] The Kimchi here referred to is *David* Kimchi, also called *Redak*, ר׳דוד קמחי=רד״ק (born A.D. 1160, died about 1235), who wrote commentaries on nearly the whole of the Old Testament, and who is the author of the famous Hebrew Grammar called מכלול, and the Lexicon entitled השרשים. He may be regarded as the teacher of Hebrew of both Jews and Christians throughout Europe. Comp. Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, *s. v.* KIMCHI, where an account is given of his contributions to Hebrew lexicography and Biblical exegesis.

later great sages of blessed memory, who were nearer our time, and who maintained that the *Keri* and the *Kethiv* originated as follows: During the Babylonian captivity, when the sacred books were lost and scattered about, and those wise men who were skilled in the Scriptures were dead, the men of the Great Synagogue found different readings in the sacred books; and in every place where they met with a doubtful and perplexing case they wrote down a word in the text, but did not put the vowels to it, or wrote it in the margin and left it out in the text, not being sure as to what they found. Thus far their words. But I am far from adopting their opinion, as I shall shew in the sequel, and refute them from the Talmud.

I shall, secondly, notice the differences which in many places exist between our Talmud and the Massorites, and everywhere side with the latter, and state what we have learned from them.

האחרונים זכרונם לברכה, קרובים לזמנינו, אשר הניחו כי הקרי וכתיב נמצאו כן, כי בגלות הראשונה אבדו הספרים, וחשיגם הטלטול, והכמים יודעי המקרא מתו, ואנשי כנסת הגדולה מצאו מחלוקת בספרים, ובמקום שהשיגם הספק והבלבול, כתבו הא' ולא נקדוהו, או כתבו מבחוץ ולא כתבו מבפנים, להיותם מסופקים במה שמצאו, עד כאן לשונם. ועצתם רחקה מני, כאשר אבאר ואשיג עליהם מהגמרא:

וגם נעיר על ההפרש שיש בין גמרא דילן ובין בעלי המסורת בכמה רוכתי, ובכולהו נקהי בהון קהוותן, ונייתי מנהון מה דגמירנא:

וגם נשיב על המינים הדוברים עלינו עתק, כי שנינו וחלפנו בתורתינו הקדושה, כמו בי"ח מלין תיקון סופרים, ובעטור סופרים[12] והקרי וכתיב, ונוהג מנהגם:

גם אבאר הסדר אשר נהגתי במסרה קטנה ובמסרה גדולה, למען ירוץ הקורא בה:

וקודם אערוך מלחמה עם החכמים האחרונים זכרונם לברכה, הקרובים לזמנינו זה, כי דברו שלא כהוגן על תורתנו הקדושה, באומרם כי הקרי וכתיב היו ספקות נסתפקו אנשי כנסת הגדולה, ואלה שמותם ולשונם:

האפודי[13] בפרק שביעי מספרו בדקדוק

I shall, thirdly, refute the heretics who dared to accuse us of wilfully altering and changing passages in our holy law, as in the case of the eighteen passages called the corrections of the Scribes, the removal of the *Vav* by the Scribes,[12] the *Keri* and the *Kethiv*, and the order of the construction.

I shall, fourthly, explain the plan which I have adopted, both in the Massorah parva and the Massorah magna, to facilitate the reader.

Let me then, firstly, do battle with the sages of blessed memory, who lived nearer our time, for they spoke unseemly against our holy law, saying that the *Keri* and the *Kethiv* exhibit the doubts which the men of the Great Synagogue entertained. And these are their names, and these their words.

Ephodi,[13] in chap. vii. of his grammar, writes as follows: "Ezra easily find what he wants.[11] Like a bear bereft of its young ones he hastened to this work, for he loved the daughter of Jacob. He summoned the workmen who were skilled in printing, and each one with his tools in his hand at once betook himself to the work. Seeing then that the work was urgent, and that it would redound to the glory of Israel, inasmuch as it will shew the nations and princes the beauty and excellence of our holy law, — for since it was committed to writing nothing has appeared like it, — and seeing, moreover, that its excellency was magnified in the eyes of the publisher, becoming, as it were, the chief corner-stone with him, I set my face to the fulfilling of his desire.

---

[12] An explanation of the phrases, '*emendations of the Scribes*,' and '*the removal of Vav* by the Scribes,' will be found below, p. 48, &c.

[13] Ephodi (אפד) is the appellation of R. Isaac b. Moses Ha-Levi, the celebrated grammarian and polemical writer, who flourished A.D. 1360–1412. It is a contraction of אמר, אני פרופייט דורן, *thus says*, or *I*, *Prophiat Duran;* and though it is the same

And now, since many of the people, and among them are even some of the different classes of our learned contemporaries, who in their heart value neither Massorah nor any of the methods of the Massorah, say, What profit can be derived from the Massorah? and for this reason it has almost been forgotten and lost, therefore I bestirred myself, as this afforded me the opportunity to do the work of the Lord, to shew the nations and the princes the value of the Massorah; for without it none of the sacred books, and particularly the Pentateuch, can be written with propriety and correctness.

We purpose, in the first place, to reply to and refute some of the

למען ירוץ קורא בה למצוא מבוקשו,[11] ותכף כדוב שכול לא אחר לעשות, כי חפץ בבת יעקב, קרא לאומנים הבקיאים בטיב הדפוס, ואיש כלי מפצו בידו לעשות מלאכתו, ובראותי כי הדבר נהוץ, ותועלת ותפארת ישראל, להראות העמים והשרים יופי ומעלת תורתינו הקדושה, כי למן היום אשר נתנה בספר לא נעשת כמתכונתה, וגדלה מעלתה בעיני הבונים היתה לראש פנה, שמתי מגמת פני למלאת כספו :

ובהיות כי ראיתי הרבה מההמון, ועמם הרבה מכתות חכמינו אשר עמנו היום בדורינו זה, אינם מעריכין בלבם לא מסורת ולא הד מדרכי המסרה, באמרם כי מה תועלת ימשך להם ממנה, וכמעט נשכחה ונאבדה : לכן נערתי חצני משום עת לעשות ליי, להראות העמים והשרים מעלת המסרה, וכי זולתה אי איפשר לכתוב הספרים ביושר ובתיקון, וכל שכן ספר תורה :

וגם נשיב ונשיג על קצת מגדולי הכמינו

---

to the end of the Hebrew Scriptures, where all the words on which there are any Massoretic remarks are classified and arranged in alphabetical order. This portion as has been remarked in the preceding note, is called *Massorah finalis*. The *Aruch* (ערוך) is the celebrated Rabbinic and Aramaic Lexicon of R. Nathan B. Jechiel (born about 1030, died about 1106), which was finished A.D. 1101. It was first published sometime before 1480, in square letters, then in Pisauri 1517, then in Venice 1531, by Bomberg, in beautiful square letters, and several times since. The best edition, however, is that of Landau, in five volumes, Prague, 1819-1824. Etheridge's description of the time when this Lexicon was finished, as well as his remarks about the *editio princeps* (*Jerusalem and Tiberius*, Longmans, 1856, pp. 284, &c.), are incorrect. Comp. Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, cols. 2040-2043. Zunz, *Notes on Ascher's Edition of the Itinerary of Rabbi Benjamin of Tudela*, London, 1841, vol. ii., p. 18; Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, *s. v.* NATHAN B. JECHIEL.

[11] A description of this Rabbinic Bible has already been given, *vide supra*, p. 6, &c.

And it came to pass, after I had remained there for some time, doing my work, the work of heaven, the Lord, blessed be his name, stirred up the spirit of the noble master for whom I worked, and encouraged his heart to publish the twenty-four sacred books. Whereupon he said to me, Gird up thy loins now like a man, for I want to publish the twenty-four sacred books, provided they contain the commentaries, the Targums, Massorah magna and the Massorah parva,[8] *the Keri* and *Kethiv*, and *the ethiv Kvelo Keri*,[9] *plene* and *defective*, and all the glosses of the Scribes, with appendices containing the Massorah magna, according to the alphabetical order of *the Aruch*,[10] so that the reader may

ויהי כי ארכו לי שם הימים, לעשות מלאכתי מלאכת שמים, העיר השם יתברך רוח השר אשר עשיתי עמו, ואמץ לבבו, להדפים עשרים וארבע, ויאמר לי אזור נא כגבר חלציך, כי חפצי להדפים עשרים וארבע, באופן זה שיהיה עם פירושים ותרגום ומסרה גדולה וקטנה[8] וקריין וכתבן וכתבן ולא קריין[9] ומלאי סוחסרים וכולהו דקדוקי ספרי, ובתר הכי המסרה הגדולה כדרך הערוך[10]

---

ben Meier, grandson of Rashi, and a very excellent commentator of the Bible. He was born about A.D. 1085, and died about 1155. Comp. Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, *s. v.* RASHBAM.

[8] Both the Massorah magna (מסורה הגדולה) and the Massorah parva (מסורה הקטנה) contain the traditional and authoritative glosses on the external form of the Hebrew text. The former, which is generally given in the margin above and below the text, as well as at the end of the Rabbinic Bibles, is more extensive, and quotes in full the passages which come under the same rubric; whilst the latter, which is written in the margin at the side of the text, or in the margin between the columns containing the Hebrew text and the Chaldee paraphrase, simply indicates the number of the passages which come under the same rubric, or hints at other glosses in an abbreviated form, without giving the reference. It was for want of space in the margin of the Hebrew text that the Massorah magna had to be divided into two parts. The divisions thus obtained are respectively denominated—i. מסורה גליונית, MASSORAH MARGINALIS, because this portion of it is given above and below the text; and, ii. מסורה מערכית or מסורה סופיית, MASSORAH FINALIS, because this portion is given at the end of the Rabbinic Bibles.

[9] The various readings exhibited in the KERI (*i. e.*, as read in the margin), and THE KETHIV (*i. e.*, as written in the text), are divisible into three general classes—i. The class denominated KERI AND KETHIV and KETHIV AND KERI (כתיב וקרי, קרי וכתיב), which comprises words differently read to what they are written, arising from the omission, insertion, exchanging, or transposition of a *single letter*. This class, by far the greater portion of the marginal readings, may properly be called VARIATIONS. ii. The class called KERI VELO KETHIV (קרי ולא כתיב), *marginal insertions of entire words not to be found written in the text*, of which the Massorah gives ten instances, viz., Judges x. 13; Ruth iii. 5, 17; 2 Sam. viii. 3, xvi. 23, xviii. 20; 2 Kings xix. 31, 37; Jer. xxxi. 38, l. 29; and, iii. The class called KETHIV VELO KERI (כתיב ולא קרי) *omissions in the margin of entire words written in the text*, of which the Massoráh gives eight instances, viz., Ruth iii. 12; 2 Sam. xiii. 33, xv. 31; 2 Kings v. 18; Jer. xxxviii. 16, xxxix. 12, li. 3; Ezek. xlviii. 16. For a more extensive discussion on this subject, see the article KERI and KETHIV, in Kitto's *Cyclopædia*.

[10] As the glosses which constitute the Massorah magna are too extensive to be given entire in the margin of the text, by far the greater portion of them have been removed

did not know as much, nor nearly as much [as he supposed], in accordance with that we find at the end of chap. ii. of *Jerusalem Maccoth*: "A man who knows only one book, when he is in a place where he is respected for knowing two books, is in duty bound to say I only know one book." [4] And as I have no great intellect, how could I, being so low and insignificant, undertake such great things, from which, peradventure, mischief might ensue, seeing that R. Ishmael had already exhorted a Scribe in his days (*Sota*, 20 *a*, and in other places), "My son, take great care how thou doest thy work, for thy work is the work of heaven, lest thou drop or add a letter, and thereby wilt be a destroyer of the whole world," [5] which is still more applicable to the present time, when the distinction between the oral and written law has ceased, as both are now written down, and a mistake may describe the right wrong, and the wrong right. Therefore, I felt that I must not rely upon my own judgment, but examine two or three codices, and follow them wherever they agree; and if they do not agree, must choose from among the readings those which appear to me unobjectionable, and sift them till I am convinced that they are correct and clear, especially as Ramban [6] and Rashbam [7] have already counselled, in their Theological Decisions, not to make emendations upon mere conjectures.

אמינא ליה דאנא לא ידענא כולי האי, ולא קרוב מחאי, כדגרסינן בירושלמי סוף פרק אלו הגולין, בר נש דתני חדא מכילא והוא אזל לאתר דאינון מוקרין ליה בגין תרתי, צריך למימר לחו חדא מכילא אנא חכים, כלומר בהדא מסכתא אני חכם,[4] ולפי דדעתי קלישא דמה אנא המעוט השפל לחכנס בגדולות כאלה, דחס ושלום נפיק מניהו חרבא כהא דרבי ישמעאל בפרק היה נוטל ובדוכרתי אחרירתי, בני הזהר במלאכתך שמלאכתך מלאכת שמים, שמא תחסיר או תותיר אות נמצאת מהריב העולם כלו.[5] וכל שכן בזמן הזה, דאין לחלק בין תורה שבכתב לתורה שבעל פה, שמאז חושמה בספר אין בין זה לזה, שמזה יבא לאסור המותר ולהתיר האסור, לפום כן לא סמיכנא על דעתי, עד דחזינא בספרי דוקני בתרין ותלתא, אי הוו מכווני מוטב, ואי לא ברירנא מנהון מה דחזי לן דלא קשה מידי, ומתקנינן ליה עד דאתבריר לן דנהיר וצהיר, וכבר הזהירו והרביצו אלה הרמב׳ן[6] והרשב׳א[7] בחידושיהם לבלתי הגיה מסברא :

---

[4] The quotation from the Talmud is not literal. It is as follows: בר נש דחכם חדא מיכלה ואזיל לאת׳ ואינון מייקרין ליה כד הוא חכם תרין מיכלא צריך לומר לון חדא מיכלא אנא חכימ׳ (Comp. *Jerusalem Maccoth*, ii. 7, p. 32 *a*, ed. Græetz. Krotoshin, 1866). It must be added, that the *editio princeps* rightly reads חכים, at the end of the quotation, and that the future editions have wrongly substituted for it מכיר.

[5] Neither is this quotation literal. It is as follows in the Talmud: בני הוי זהיר שמלאכתך מלאכת שמים היא שמא תחסיר אות אחת או תתיר אות אחת נמצאת אתה מחריב את כל העולם כולו

[6] *Ramban* (רמב׳ן), is a contraction of the initials of ר׳ משה בן נחמן, *R. Moses b. Nachman* = Nachmanides. This distinguished Commentator, Talmudist, and Kabbalist was born at Gerona, in Catalonia, about 1195, whence he is also called by Christian writers *Moses Gerundensis*. He died at Ano (Ptolemais), about 1270. For his life and writings, see Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, *s. v.* NACHMANIDES.

[7] *Rashbam* רשב"ם is a contraction of the initials of רבי שמואל בן מאיר, *Rabbi Samuel*

their rear-guard, and run in their path day and night, and toil, but can never come up to them.

Thus says the writer: I was dwelling quietly in my house, and flourishing in my abode, prosecuting diligently my studies, at Tunis, which is on the borders of ancient Carthage, when fate removed me to the West, but did not withdraw its hand from afflicting me, and afterwards brought me to the famous city of Venice. And even here I had nothing to do, for the hand of fate was still lifted up, and exalted over me; and its troubles and cares found me in the city, smote me, wounded me, and crushed me. And after about three months of sufferings, I left for a little while the furnace of my afflictions, for I was in a thirsty land. I said in the thoughts of my heart, I will arise now, and walk about the streets of the city. As I was walking in the streets, wandering quietly, behold God sent a highly distinguished and pious Christian, of the name of Daniel Bomberg, to meet me. May his Rock and Redeemer protect him! This was effected through the exertions of an Israelite, who bestowed great kindness upon me, and whose name is R. Chajim Alton, son of the distinguished Moses Alton. May his Rock and Redeemer protect him! He brought me to his printing-office, and shewed me through his establishment, saying to me, Turn in, abide with me,[3] for here thou shalt find rest for thy soul, and balm for thy wound, as I want thee to revise the books which I print, correct the mistakes, purify the style, and examine the works, till they are as refined silver and as purified gold.

Although I saw that his desire was greater than my ability, yet I thought that we must not refuse a superior. Still I told him that I

שבליהם, ומזנבים נחשליהם, ויום ולילה נרוץ במעגליהם, וניגע ולא ניגע אליהם:

אמר המגיד, שלו הייתי בביתי, ורענן בהיכלי, שוקד על למודי בטונים המדינה, אשר קרוב לקצה גבול קרטגינא הקדומה, וטלטלני הזמן בארצות המערב, לא השיב ידו מבלע ושב ורפא לו, ודחני פה ויניצייא הבירה, היא העיר הגדולה, וגם פה לא עשיתי מאומה, כי יד הזמן נשגבה ורמה, וטרדותיו וסבותיו בעיר מצאוני, הכוני פצעוני הממוני, ויהיו כמשלש חדשים למכותי, יצאתי מעט מכור התלאות, ואני בארץ תלאובות, אמרתי ברעיוני הלבבות, אקומה נא ואסובבה בעיר בשוקים וברחובות, כצאתי את העיר משתאה מחריש, והנה לקראתי כי הקרא יהוה לפני איש אחר מחסידי הנוצרים איש היחס והמעלה שמו מסי **דניאל בומבירגי**, ישמרהו צורו וגאלו, בהשתדלות איש עברי, אשר הרבה טובותיו עמי, שמו רבי חיים אלטון, בן הנעלה רבי משה אלטון, ישמרהו צורו וגאלו, ויביאני אל בית דפוסו, ויראני כל בית נכותו, ויאמר סורה שבה עמדי[3] כי פה תמצא מרגוע לנפשך, וצרי למכתך, כי חפצתי שתגיה ספרי הנדפסים, להסיר מהם מוקשי הטעות, ותזככם ותצרפם בכור העיונית, ותשקלם במאזני הישריות, עד יצאו מלובנים ומצורפים כצרוף כסף, ומבוחנים כבחון הזהב:

ואף על פי שראיתי כספו גדולה מהשגתי, אמרתי בלבי אין מסרבין לגדול, ואפילו הכי

---

[3] The expression עמדי, *with me*, is not the *editio princeps*, but there can be no doubt that it has dropped out by mistake. The subsequent editions have, therefore, rightly inserted it.

thereof. Now God gave it to his people whom he had chosen for himself — gave it to them only to be concealed under the shadow of His hand; for they alone know its mysteries, its grammar, its rules, and its anomalies. And the men of the Great Synagogue,[2] in whom was heavenly light, bright and powerful, like pure gold, on whose heart every statute of the Law was engraved, have set up marks, and built a wall around it, and made ditches between the walls, and bars, and gates, to preserve the citadel in its splendour and brightness; and they all came to the transparent cloud of its burning doctrine and rising incense; and they sanctified themselves to take the fire from off its altar, so that no other hand might touch it and desecrate it so as to become a bat for every fool; they strung together its golden words from columns of the Word of God — words of purity; and the Spirit alighted upon them, and as if by prophecy they wrote down their labours in books, to which nothing is to be added. The princes of the people gathered together to hear their sublime words; and when they had finished their work, the supernatural vision and its source were sealed, and the glory and splendour departed, and the angel of the Lord appeared no more. For no one rose after them who could do as they did. And now we are here this day gathering the gleanings which they have left; and we capture the faint ones of

אשר נתנה לעם אשר בחר לו, להם
לבדם הביאה, ובצל ידו החביאה, והם
ידעו סודיה, דקדוקיה ופרטיה, ומסלות
ארחותיה, ואנשי הכנסיה הגדולה[2] אשר
היה בתוכם אור הבזק. הנמרץ החזק,
הזהב המוזקק, אשר בלבו כל הק מחוקק,
הציבו ציונים, ובנו לה חיל וחומה, ומקוה
בין החומותים, וישימו בריח ודלתים, לבצר
מעוזה ולהשאירה, ברה וטהורה, ויתנגשו
כלם לערפל שביב לקחה, ותימרות רקחה,
והתקדשו לחתות אש שיחה, אשר על
מזבחה, למען לא ישולח בה יד ולא
ירמסנה כף ישימנה מטרה לכל סכל, וקשרו
קשרי רצי זהב מלותיה, מטור אמרות יהוה,
אמרות טהורות, ותנח עליהם הרוח, והמה
בכתובים ויתנבאו ולא יספו, ולשמוע
נוראות, ניבם נדיבי עמים נאספו, ואחריהם
נסתם החזון ומוצאו, ונסתלק הכבוד ההוא
ומוראו, ולא יסף עוד מלאך יהוה להראה,
כי לא קם אחריהם, מי יעשה כמעשיהם,
והנה אנחנו אלה פה היום, מלקטים שכחת

---

[2] The Great Synagogue or Synod (כנסת הגדולה, כנשתא רבתא, *Synagoga magna*) to which Jacob b. Chajim refers, was instituted by Nehemiah (comp. Neh. x. 1–10; *Midrash Ruth*, cap. iii. fol. 45 *b; Jerusalem Shebiith*, v. 1, 35 *b*), and continued till the death of Simon the Just (B. C. 300), who was the last member of it. It consisted of one hundred and twenty members, comprising the representatives of the following five classes of the Jewish nation:—i. The chiefs of the Priestly divisions (ראשי בית אב); ii. The chiefs of the Levitical Families (ראשי הלויים); iii. The Heads of the Israelite Families (ראשי העם); iv. Deputies from the different towns; and, v. The distinguished men of all ranks (מבינים). They were all divided into ELDERS (זקנים, πρεσβύτεροι) and SCRIBES (סופרים γραμματεῖς); and among the many important enactments and institutions which are ascribed to them are—i. The compilation of the Hebrew canon and the various readings; ii. The composition of the Book of Esther; iii. The introduction of fixed formulæ of prayer; and iv. The foundation of colleges. Comp Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, *s. v.* SYNAGOGUE, THE GREAT.

INTRODUCTION.

Thus saith the humble Jacob ben Chajim ben Isaac Ibn Adonijah: "He entereth in peace, where the righteous rest upon their couches, who walked in uprightness."[1]

Praised be the Creator, who exists and yet none can see him, who is hidden and yet found by every one that seeks him, who graciously bestowed language on mankind in order that they might communicate precious things joined together by wisdom, so as to become one, to gather his rain and flame, and learn his words and ways. He endowed his people, his first-born son, with the holy tongue, which is the language of the Law and the Prophets, and is very wonderfully adapted to open the eyes of the blind, and impart light unto them, so that all the nations of the world may know that there is nothing like this holy language in purity of style and charm of diction; it is like a tree of life to those who possess it, and its wisdom imparts life to the owner

הקדמה

אמר הצעיר יעקב בן חיים בן יצחק ן׳ אדוניהו יש״י עמ״הן.[1]

ישתבח הבורא הנמצא ועין לא תשורנו, הנעלם וכל דרשו ימצאנו, אשר חנן למין האנושי לשון למודים, למלאת ענינים חמודים, ביד השכל צמודים, והיו לאחדים, ללקוט רביביו ושביביו, וללמוד ניביו ונתיביו, וזרח לעמו, בנו בכורו, לשון הקדש אשר היא לשון התורה והנבואות, היורדת פלאות, לפקוח עינים עורות, והיו למאורות, למען דעת כל עמי הארץ, כי לשון הקדש אין ערוך אליה, בצחות מליה, ונועם משליה, והיא כעץ חיים תרופה לבעליה, והחכמה תחיה בעליה, והאלהים

---

[1] This introductory formula is only to be found in the *editio princeps* of the Rabbinic Bible, edited by Ibn Adonijah himself (1524-25). All the subsequent editions, which were published long after his embracing Christianity and his death, have omitted it, and substituted for it the words אמר המעתיק, *thus saith the author*, thus removing from the very beginning of the Introduction to the Bible the name of the author, who had left the Jewish community. This fully confirms our opinion that his name was also removed from other works which he prepared for the press and annotated, and that his sudden disappearance from the field of literary labour is to be ascribed to the fact of his having renounced Judaism (*vide supra*, p. 13). As to the abbreviation יש״י עמ״הן, it is the accrostic of the second verse in Isaiah lvii., יבוא שלום ינוחו על משכבותם הלך נכחו which the Jews use as a euphemic expression when speaking of the dead, in consequence of the traditional explanation given to this passage. Thus the Talmud not only explains it as referring to a beatified future life, but says that, when a pious man dies, an angel announces his arrival in heaven. Whereupon the Lord says that the righteous are to go to meet and welcome him with the salutation, "He cometh in peace, to where they rest upon their couches, who walked in uprightness." (Isa. lvii. 2.) Indeed we are told that this verse is used by three companies of angels, who go to meet the saint. The first angelic group salute him with the words, "He cometh in peace!" the second with "Who walked in uprightness!" and the third with "May he rest upon his couch!" (Compare *Kethuboth*, 104*a*.)

quantity of Massoretic materials than is to be found in the independent Massorahs now discovered, but he was the first who distributed the Massoretic remarks under the proper places to which they belonged, and who arranged the whole mass of the multifarious rubrics constituting this critico-exegetical apparatus into an alphabetical and lexical order, so that any anomaly or Massoretic remark may now easily be found by the student of the Hebrew text.

That Ibn Adonijah's compilation, which involved so much research and labour, and which after all constitutes one portion *only* of his gigantic Rabbinic Bible, should contain many imperfections, is no matter of surprise to any one who understands the nature of the work. Indeed it could not be otherwise, when the state of the materials which he had to work up is considered. But though Elias Levita, his contemporary and co-worker in the same department, had already alluded to these imperfections, and rightly accounted for them by quoting the old adage that "every beginning is difficult,"[45] yet he, as well as Morinus,[46] Michaelis,[47] and others who repeated his strictures, found it a far more easy task categorically to refer to errors and omissions than to collect and correct them. Buxtorf, who alone had the courage to embark upon correcting Jacob b. Chajim Ibn Adonijah, has more generally mistaken the meaning of the Massorah than rectified the errors. Now that the Paris redaction has been published, and that another and more important independent MS. has been discovered, which yield ample materials for amending and completing this ancient critical apparatus, it will be a burning shame if those who love the Bible, and are anxious for a correct text of the Old Testament verity, do not come forward to aid in the publication of the newly discovered MS., and help us in procuring an edition of the Massorah in as complete and accessible a form as the present rich materials enable us to obtain.

---

[45] *Vide Supra*, p. 23.

[46] *Excercitatt. Biblicæ*, pp. 384, &c., 556, &c.

[47] Preface to the edition of the Hebrew Bible, cap. IV., section v., p. 21, &c., Halle, 1720.

worked at it, and that it could not have been compiled earlier than the twelfth century. This has been shown by Geiger, who refers to No. 216. Here three words are rubricated, which in an exceptional manner have *Chirek* followed by *Jod* before *Dagesh*, viz., לְמְשׁוֹסָּה (Isa. xlii. 24), בִּיקְּרוֹתֶיךָ (Psalm xlv. 10), and לִיקְּהַת (Prov. xxx. 17). Now Geiger shows that these readings were not fixed till the tenth century, and that R. Saadia Gaon (892–942), was the first who rubricated them, since Rashi (1040–1105), in his commentary on Psalm xlv. 10, mentions to have seen them in R. Saadia's *Nikkud* (נקוד רב סעדיה). From this, it is evident that this rubric was not in the Massorah in the twelfth century, and that it was inserted afterwards, since this celebrated expositor, who so frequently quotes the Massorah in his explanations of anomalous readings, would surely in this instance not have referred to R. Saadia's *Nikkud*, had the rubric in question then formed part of the Massorah. As the compilers of the Paris redaction made their compilation from Massorahs which already contained this rubric, it must at least have been effected *circa* 1200.

The age of the Halle MS. is not fixed by Hupfeld, and not having as yet had an opportunity of inspecting it, I cannot ascertain it. The fact, however, that both it and the Massorah finalis contain many incomplete lists, and that the order in which the anomalies are enumerated is not according to the sequence of the books, shows that the materials from which they were elaborated were not only the same as but much older than the Paris redaction, and that the latter was made at the time when these Massoretic materials had already been shaped into proper order and form. It is therefore of the utmost importance that the Halle MS. should be published, for it is only by a careful comparison of the three Massorahs, viz., the Paris redaction, the Halle MS., and the Massorah finalis, that the readings of the Hebrew verity can properly be fixed.

Now that two independent Massorahs have been discovered, we are in a better position to judge of the labour which Ibn Adonijah bestowed upon his compilation. Not only have the Paris and Halle redactions incomparably less rubrics than the printed Massorah, but they have neither any fixed plan nor definite order in the disposition and arrangement of the various rubrics. With the exception of sometimes placing together a few lists of similar subjects, they have an arbitrary sequence of the different articles. Jacob b. Chajim Ibn Adonijah, therefore, has not only the merit of having amassed a larger about thirteen rubrics (161, 167–170, 176–181, 214, 216–218), which are wanted in the former. Rubric 180, however, of the Paris redaction, is to be found in the marginal additions of the Halle redaction, and rubric 214 stands as rubric 163, second part of the Halle MS. Greater differences between the two redactions occur in the third group of the Halle MS. (151–170), though the bulk of this group is also to be found in the Paris redaction. Thus Nos. 155–161 are in the latter 76–78, 85–89, 348, 350–353. The corresponding portion in the Paris Massorah, however, is much richer, having lists of logical deductions (182–184); textual phenomena (192–194, 268, 273–295); registers of expressions repeated in the same verses (296–365); and of unique forms and combinations (254–267, 366–373), which are not found in the Halle MS. The latter again has two lists of anomalies in the Divine names and their various combinations (152–154); five catalogues of לא and ולא (162–167), and other things which do not exist in the former.

The real difference, however, is to be seen in the second part. Here the Halle MS. is much richer than the Paris redaction. Thus, for instance, the latter wants the whole of the second group (Nos. 89–108), and has only three rubrics of the one hundred and eighty-eight which constitute the fourth group (156–344) in the Halle MS., viz., those which are in the Halle MS. Nos. 163, 277, 327. These are in the Paris redaction Nos. 214, 369, 191. Moreover the one hundred and thirty short rules which stand after No. 279 in the Halle MS., are also wanting in the Paris redaction. Of all the rules which are to be found in the marginal glosses and in the Appendices, with the exception of the marginal notes on the first group of the second part (Nos. 1–88), only about fifteen occur in the Paris redaction. Altogether the Paris redaction has about fifty rubrics which are not to be found in the Halle MS., as well as about fifty lists of words which occur in the same verse. Moreover, of the twenty-four rubrics in the Appendix to the Paris Massorah, the Halle MS. has only two rubrics, viz., 23 and 24. The Halle MS., on the other hand, has at least five hundred rubrics which are not to be found in the Paris redaction.

As to the age of the Paris redaction, this cannot be ascertained even approximately. All that is known for certain is that several hands

---

which properly begins the third group, giving a list of 154 instances wherein אדנָי occurs in contrast to אדנַי, and which, too, is wanted in the Paris redaction.

following striking points must be adduced. Apart from the fact that the Halle redaction has nearly treble the number of rubrics, the one having upwards of a thousand, the other scarcely four hundred, a comparison of the materials which these two Massorahs contain in common will show that they both proceeded from the same ancient source, and have been so elaborated, curtailed, expanded, and adapted, as to meet the special requirements of the respective redactors. Before, however, we proceed to point out this connection, it is necessary to remark that the essential portion of the Massorah, which treats on the forms of the words, and gives the number of times these forms occur, is divisible into two parts. The one specifies only the exceptional or rare forms, which occur once, twice, thrice, or at most four times, grouping these together according to analogies, or parallels, or alphabetical lists, or in certain numbers. The other part gives the number of times certain words occur, and assumes the form of a concordance. The Paris redaction is devoted more especially to the first part, whilst the Halle redaction embraces both parts. It is by comparing that part of the Halle redaction which rubricates the anomalies catalogued in the Paris redaction, that we can see the affinity of the two.

Now on comparing the first part of the Halle MS. with the Paris Massorah, it will at once be evident that both the redactors had the same materials before them. The first list in both begins with the significant words *Ochla Ve-Ochla.* The first great group of alphabetical lists and pairs of forms which occur once or twice only, contained in the first part of the Halle redaction (Nos. 1–70), is to be found in the Paris Massorah entirely, and in the same order, with the exception that No. 13 of the former stands as No. 70 in the latter. The same is the case with the second group of the Halle MS. (Nos. 71–150). These are almost entirely to be found in the Paris redaction, only that rubrics 71 and 72 in the Halle, are rubrics 80 and 81 in the Paris Massorah; and that the latter contains alphabetical, and a few other lists from 82 to 90, so that the parallel sequence is resumed with rubric 91; rubrics 73–150 of the Halle MS. having their correspondence in rubrics 91–166 of the Paris redaction. In this group, however, the Halle MS. has ten rubrics in the orthography of certain words,[44] which are wanting in the Paris Massorah, whilst the latter has with the same examples, only without the inscription of the last rubric; whilst the Paris redaction, edited by Dr. Frensdorff (rubric 274) mixes up both the order of the Canaanitish names and the absence of the *Vav* in one rubric, with the inscription, "twenty verses in which the sequence of the words is irregular; fourteen of them have each a peculiar order, and also those which have *Vav*, and those which have not *Vav*.[39]"

---

[44] These rubrics are on the orthography of הוא, לְכָה, כַּלֹּה, שְׂדֵי, זה, נבוכדנצר and היא, as well as on ידיך, מעשׂי, עשׂי. To this may also be added the contrast (חלוף), to rule 151,

iii. In many instances where Ibn Adonijah's compilation is defective and incorrect, and the Paris redaction is correct, the Halle redaction has the same blunders as the printed Massorah. Thus in the alphabetical list of words which occur once only with the preposition אֶל, and once with the preposition עַל, the Massorah finalis gives three incorrect instances, viz., עַל הַמְּזוּזָה, אֶל מְלֶאכֶת, and אֶל קוֹלְךָ, which do not occur, and which are rightly wanting in the Paris redaction;[40] whilst the Halle redaction has the same errors. In the alphabetical list of words occurring twice, once with the article ה, and once without it, the Massorah finalis erroneously gives הַכֶּבֶשׂ הָאֶחָד, inasmuch as it not only occurs in the passage adduced (Exod. xxix. 29), but also in Levit. xiv. 12. This error, which does not occur in the Paris redaction,[41] is also to be found in the Halle MS. The printed Massorah, in the incomplete alphabetical list of words which respectively occur, once with *Daleth*, and once with *Resh*, erroneously places וַיִּפְרוּ under the letter *Pe*, instead of *Vav*, which is also the case in the Halle redaction; whilst in the Paris redaction it is in its right place.[42] The alphabetical list of words beginning with ומ, and occurring only once, to which reference has already been made,[43] is exactly as imperfect in the Halle redaction as it is in the Massorah finalis. The other instances, adduced by Hupfeld, which exhibit the agreement in the imperfections between the printed Massorah and the Halle MS., we must omit for want of space.

As to the relation of the Halle MS. to the Paris redaction, the which already occur in the marginal notes, make together about two hundred and fourteen. Then follow, on two unnumbered half leaves, thirty-four rubrics, written in Rabbinic characters, of forms and phrases with peculiar points and orthography, and of verses containing certain words. And, finally, there are other pages (pp. 135 *a*–136 *a*) of lists, written in Rabbinic characters, giving the passages throughout the entire Old Testament where *Pattach (Segol)* is to be found with *Athnach* and *Soph Pasuk*. The Appendix, therefore, contains (214 + 34 =) 248 additional rubrics, thus making the sum total upwards of a thousand rubrics.

---

[39] כ׳ פסוקים דמשתבשין בהון י״ד מנהון מיחדין וסומן אלין דנסבין וי״ו ואלין בלא נסבין וי׳ו. Compare rubric 274, p. 53, &c.; 149, ed. Frensdorff, Hanover, 1864.

[40] Compare *Massorah finalis*, letter *Aleph*, p 7 *b*, with the Paris redaction, rubric 2, p. 3, &c., notes.

[41] Compare *Massorah finalis*, under letter *He*, p. 21 *a*, col. 3, with the Paris redaction, rubric 3, p. 4, notes.

[42] Compare *Massorah finalis*, under letter *Daleth*, p. 19 *b*, col. 1, with Paris redaction, rubric 7, p. 6.

[43] *Vide supra*, p. 27.

It now remains that we should point out the relationship of this redaction of the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, or the great Massorah, both to Ibn Adonijah's compilation, and to the redaction published by Dr. Frensdorff.

i. The Halle MS., though rich in its Massoretic lore, has incomparably fewer rubrics than Ibn Adonijah's compilation.

ii. In several instances where the arrangement and superscription of the rubrics in Ibn Adonijah's compilation differs to advantage from the Paris redaction, edited by Dr. Frensdorff, the Halle MS. agrees with the printed Massorah. Thus the Massorah marginalis, on Levit. i. 1, in giving the alphabetical lists of words which occur once only with *Kametz*, instead of *Pattach*, adds the important designation, בזקפא with *Zakeph*. The Halle redaction, where this rubric is No. 22, has the same addition, whereas in the Paris redaction, where it is No. 21, this definition is omitted. Again, the rubric of the verses giving the names of the Canaanitish nations, has the inscription in the Massorah finalis, "two groups of three verses each in which the six names, viz., the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Amorites, the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites, follow in the same order; in fourteen verses they have a unique order, making together twenty verses,"[37] distinguishing two features, first the order of the Canaanitish nations, and second the absence of the *Vav*. In accordance with this the two groups are first enumerated, whereupon follow the instances, in each one of which the order is peculiar,[38] mostly in pairs. After this follow two other rubrics, with separate inscriptions, giving the variations of *Vav*, &c. The Halle redaction has the same arrangement, second group consists of eighty lists (71 – 150), giving the various readings, and thus being to a certain extent of a critical nature. Of these, the first two lists only are still alphabetical, the others are incomplete alphabets. The third group consists of twenty lists (151 – 170), of a similar import to those in the first group. Besides the rubrics, there are a great number of marginal additions throughout this part. They are written both in small square and in Rabbinic characters. Some of these simply continue the statements in the text, or supplement the examples adduced; but most of them contain new lists, so that the total number of lists in the first part amounts to upwards of 260.

---

[37] חד מן ב׳ זוגין מן ג׳ אית בהון מן ו׳ מלין הכנעני החתי האמרי הפרזי החוי והיבוסי י״ד פסוקים דמיחדין כולהון כ׳ פסוקים. Compare that portion of it entitled *Various Readings* (חלופי קריאה), p. 62 *b*, ed. Frankfurter, or ed. Buxtorf.

[38] There are properly only twelve instances, Exod. xiii. 5, and Josh. xxiv. 11, being omitted.

The Second Part extends over fol. 73 – 128, as well as over an unnumbered folio, thus making together fifty-seven leaves, or one hundred and fourteen pages, and contains three hundred and forty-three rubrics, which are again divisible into groups. The first group consists of eighty-eight lists (1 – 88), of forms of peculiar verbs and nouns, just as a concordance. The second group consists of twenty-one registers (89 – 109), of textual phenomena, similar to those enumerated in the first part. The third group consists of forty-five rubrics (110 – 155), of words, which are unique in one book only, which are peculiar in their orthography, vowel points, or terminations. The fourth group consists of a hundred and eighty-eight registers (156 – 344), giving forms and textual peculiarities of all sorts. Besides these numbered ones, there are two lists, one between Nos. 113 and 114, and the other at the end, which are not numbered, so that the total sum of rubrics in this part is three hundred and forty-five. To this must be added a large unnumbered piece, extending over six pages, designated כללות, and giving one hundred and thirty short rubrics, between Nos. 279 and 280. There are, moreover, in this part, a much larger number of marginal additions than in the first part. They are to be found on almost every page, and the additional rubrics amount to upwards of a hundred and eighty; so that the total number of rubrics in the second part amounts to upwards of five hundred and twenty.

Immediately after the second part, p. 129 *a*, are registers of the numbers of verses in the Old Testament, the chronology of Biblical events, and the respective authors of the sacred books. Whereupon follow, pp. 129 *b* – 132 *b*, sundry Massoretic remarks, which, though under the inscription זו ממסרה הקטנה, *this is from the Massorah parva*, consist mostly of lists of peculiar forms, orthography, and phrases strictly connected with the *Massorah magna*. These lists, some of

Massorah, and yet anxious to maintain that it is the identical *Ochla Ve-Ochla* which is quoted by Kimchi, Ibn Aknin, and others, which Levita made the basis of his Massoretic labours, and which he positively declares yielded to Jacob b. Chajim *the greatest part of his compilation*, Dr. Frensdorff simply disputes Levita's statement. But so plain a declaration by a contemporary scholar, and the first Massoretic authority of his time, is not to be set aside. Indeed, Dr. Frensdorff would never have resorted to so desperate and hazardous a measure, had he not started from the false hypothesis, that there was only one redaction of the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, and that his was the unique copy which has survived the ravages of time. The incorrectness of this assumption, however, is now proved beyond the shadow of a doubt, by the discovery of another and much larger redaction of the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* than that published by Dr. Frensdorff. The MS. is in the Library of the University of Halle (Y. *b* 10), and a description of it, by the late Professor Hupfeld, has just appeared in the Journal of the German Oriental Society.[36] This description we recast and condense, so as to adapt it for our purpose, in order to show its relationship both to Ibn Adonijah's compilation, or the Massorah finalis, and to the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, edited by Dr. Frensdorff.

The Halle MS., which is a small quarto on parchment, beautifully written in square Hebrew characters of the middle ages, consists of 138 numbered leaves, or 276 pages, and contains upwards of 1,000 Massoretic rubrics, in two parts, as follows:—

The First Part wants six leaves of apparently a grammatical import. On p. 7 *a* stands, after the superscription סימן מלכי ישראל, a table of the accents, with their respective figures and names; and on p. 7 *b*–11, an Index (7 *b*–11), of the Rubrics contained in both parts. The Massorah proper of the first part, which contains one hundred and seventy rubrics, begins on p. 12 and extends to p. 72, thus embracing sixty-one leaves, or one hundred and twenty-two pages. The rubrics of this part, which contain almost exclusively the essence and older portion of the Massorah, viz., lists of words, forms, and constructions of a unique nature or rare occurrence, are divisible into three groups. The first group consists of seventy, nearly all alphabetical lists (1–70) of words, forms of words, and combinations, which occur once only, or a few times, partly alone, and partly with certain prefixes, with this or that vowel or accent. The from it.[34] Now the most cursory comparison of the two works will show, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that Ibn Adonijah could not have had before him the redaction of the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, published by Dr. Frensdorff; and that either this *Ochla Ve-Ochla* is not the one which Levita made the principal basis of his Massoretic studies, and which is quoted by Kimchi, Ibn Aknim, &c., or that Levita's statement is not true.

---

[36] Comp. *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. xxi., pp. 201–220. Leipzig, 1867.

Indeed, Dr. Frensdorff himself admits that the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, which has recently been found in the Imperial Library at Paris, and which he has published, could not possibly have been used by Jacob Ibn Adonijah. We cannot do better than give Dr. Frensdorff's own proofs for this statement: i. The *Ochla Ve-Ochla* has fifty-six articles which are wanting in Ibn Adonijah's compilation, and which he surely would not have omitted if he had had this redaction before him; and ii. Some of the articles, which are to be found in the two Massorahs alike, are very defective in the printed Massorah finalis, thus showing that Ibn Adonijah did not copy the articles into his compilation from this redaction of the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, or the articles in the copy would have been as complete as those in the original.

Thus under the alphabetical list of words which begin with *Vav* and *Mem*, and occur only once, Ibn Adonijah remarks, "the above registers, which begin with ומ in alphabetical order, from ומא to ומל, have all been collected from several Massoretic treatises, piece by piece. There is, however, a large alphabetical list of them complete, from ומא to ומת; but he has not been able to procure it complete, except from ומל to ומת. The rest he has had to search out register by register, and he does not know whether it is complete or defective." [35] If Ibn Adonijah had before him the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, published by Dr. Frensdorff, he would have found this complete list in No. xviii. Moreover, from this list, which occurs in the list in the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, he would have been able to fill up many a gap which occurs in the list of the Massorah finalis, from וכל to ומת.

Constrained to admit that Ibn Adonijah could not have had this redaction of the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* before him when compiling the cclxxxiii., cclxxxiv., cclxxxvi., cclxxxvii., ccxciv., ccci., cccvi., cccvii., cccviii., cccix., cccxvii., cccxxix., cccxxx., cccxxxi., cccxlii., cccxlix., ccclx., ccclxviii., ccclxx., and portions of three rubrics, Nos., xviii., cclxvi., and cccxxvii.[33] iii. Some of the parallel rubrics in the one have occasionally a few instances less than the other, and *vice versa.* iv. The order in which the instances are enumerated in the respective rubrics is more confused, and less in accordance with the sequence of the books in the Bible in Ibn Adonijah's compilation, than in the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*. In the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* the order of the books is as follows: Pentateuch, earlier Prophets as usual, then Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah, and the Minor Prophets; the Five Megilloth are sometimes placed before the Psalms, and sometimes before Chronicles; sometimes, however, they follow irregularly immediately after the Hagiographa.

---

[34] גם כל המסורה הנדפסת פה וויני״סייה בעשרים וארבע הגדול רובו אינו אלא מספר ההוא *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, p. 138, ed. Ginsburg.

[35] אמר המעתיק כל א״ו השטו דמשמשין ומה בא״ב מא׳ ועד ל׳ כולהון לקטוי׳ מספרי המסר׳ זעיר שם זעיר שם׳ אבל היא כולה א״ב גדולה אחת דמשמשת ומא׳ עד הת״ו לא הגיע לידה ממנה ביחד כי אם מל׳ ועד ת״ו ושאר לקטתי׳ שטה שטה ולא ידענא אם חסר או לא עכ״ל. Comp. *Massorah finalis*, p. 44 *a*, col. 3.

With these important differences between the two redactions of the Massorah, we turn to the second question, viz., whether the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* now published by Dr. Frensdorff is the identical redaction referred to by the different lexicographers and expositors, and declared by Levita to have been used by Ibn Adonijah for his compilation. Dr. Frensdorff, the learned editor of the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, maintains that it is the identical Massoretic work which had been lost for nearly three centuries. Levita, who, as far as can be ascertained, was the last that possessed a copy of the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, and who had studied it most carefully, distinctly maintains that the greatest part of Ibn Adonijah's compilation, *i. e.*, of the present Massorah finalis, is taken

---

[33] Frensdorff also marks Nos. ccxxxix. and cclix., as wanting in Ibn Adonijah's compilation. But this is a mistake, as Geiger has already pointed out, since rubric ccxxxix., which gives three groups of words, respectively occurring three times in the same section, the first time with *Vav* conjunctive, and the second and third times without it. is also to be found in the Massorah finalis. p. 28 *b*, cols. 1 and 2, ed. Buxtorf or Frankfurter. Only that the Codex from which this rubric of the printed Massorah was taken, had erroneously *four* such groups, and that this error has been transferred into the Massorah finalis. For ואתם עדי which is quoted as occurring twice, once beginning with הגדתי (read והגדתי), and once beginning with אל תפחדו, occurs only once, and the two references are to one and the same verse, Isaiah xlviii. 8. The other rubric, No. cclix., which gives nine instances of two combined words, the first of which occurs once only with the prefix *Mem*, is to be found complete in the Massorah finalis, under the letter *Mem*, p. 43 *b*, col. 4, ed. Buxtorf or Frankfurter, where, however, מחצי חמטה, the reference to Jeremiah xxxix. 14, is erroneously put for מחצר המטרה, as the Paris redaction rightly has it. It is to be added, that in enumerating the rubrics in the Paris redaction, which are wanted in the printed Massorah, Geiger has omitted Nos. li., lx., cxxx., ccxix., and cclxv., marked by Frensdorff in his notes on the respective articles.

Commentary on the Hebrew Bible, about half a century later could no longer find it;[29] and such distinguished scholars as Lebrecht and Fürst have pronounced it as lost.[30] Dr. Derenburg, however, whilst preparing the catalogue of Hebrew MSS. in the Imperial Library, at Paris, had the good fortune to discover an independent "Great Massorah," commencing with the words *Ochla Ve-Ochla*.[31] Shortly after, Dr. Frensdorff, who has for years been engaged in Massoretic studies, heard of the discovery (January, 1859), and, with the zeal and disinterested love with which this author prosecutes his Massoretic researches, he went to Paris in 1862, copied the MS., and published it, with learned annotations, in 1864.[32]

The questions which we now purpose to examine are—i. What relationship does this Massoretic work sustain to the Massorah, published by Ibn Adonijah? And, ii. Is this *Ochla Ve-Ochla* the identical work which is quoted by Kimchi, Ibn Aknim, Isaac b. Jehudah, and Elias Levita, or is it simply one of the redactions of the ancient Great Massorah, which, like the several other redactions, obtained the appellation *Ochla Ve-Ochla?*

i. The first great difference between the Ibn Adonijah compilation and the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* is that the former contains upwards of six thousand one hundred rubrics, whilst the latter only contains about four hundred. ii. Though Ibn Adonijah's compilation comprises more than fifteen times the number of rubrics that the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* contains, yet the latter has no less than fifty-three entire rubrics which are not at all to be found in the former. They are as follows, according to the numbers of the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*:—Nos. li., lx., lxviii., lxxiii., lxxiv., lxxviii., clxxv., clxxvi., cxxx., clxxx., clxxxi., clxxxii., clxxxiii., clxxxix., ccii., ccvii., ccxvi., ccxx., ccxxiii., ccxxiv., ccxxv., ccxxvi., ccxxix., ccxxxii., ccxxxiii., ccxlii., cclvii., cclviii., cclxiii., cclxv., cclxvii., cclxxxi., cclxxxii., years been discovered in public libraries, only show how vast Ibn Adonijah's labours must have been in producing his compilation. For, not only do these MSS. exhibit the greatest diversity in details, but not a single one of them can be compared, in number of rubrics or in point of arrangement, with the present Massorah finalis. About the relationship of the Great Massorah, which the celebrated R. Gershom b. Jehodab (*circa* 960–1028), "the luminary of the dispersed," already copied with his own hands,[23] and which is frequently quoted by Rashi, and by the transcribers of the Leipsig Codex (No. 1), with Ibn Adonijah's compilation, we can say nothing, since no Codex of this particular redaction of the Great Massorah has as yet been found. We can, however, speak positively about the recently discovered and published *Ochla Ve-Ochla.*

---

[29] See the edition of the Hebrew Scriptures, with his Commentary, entitled, *A Gift Offering*, or *Oblation of Salomon ben Jehudah* (מנחת ש״י), 1 Sam. i. 9, vol. ii. p. 27 *b*. Mantua, 1742–44.

[30] Thus Lebrech, in the Introductory notes to his edition of Kimchi's Lexicon, remarks, "*sed posquam tota argumentorum ejus summa in Masoram magnam bibliorum rabbinorum transiit, ipse liber periisse videtur*, p. xlix., Berlin, 1847; and Fürst, ספר אכלה ואכלה והוא ספר מסורת וכו׳ ונראה שנאבד מאתנו.—*Appendices to his Concordance*, p. 1382.

[31] Bibliothèque Impériale, *Ancien Fonds Hébreu*, No. 56.

[32] The complete title of the book is *Das Buch Ochla W'Ochla (Massora) Herausgegeben übersetzt und mit erläuterenden Anmerkungen versehen nach einer, soweit bekant, einzigen, in der Kaiserliehen Bibliothek zu Paris befindlichen Handschrift.*—Von Dr. S. Frensdorff, Hanover, 1864.

The *Ochla Ve-Ochla,* as has already been remarked, is the name which in the course of time was given by some to one or more redactions of the independent survey of the Massorah, to distinguish it from the other *Great Massorah,*[24] which was written above and below the text of the Bible. By this appellation, this particular redaction of the Great Massorah was first quoted, towards the end of the twelfth century, by David Kimchi,[25] and Ibn Aknin.[26] It is then quoted again by Isaac b. Jehudah, in the middle of the thirteenth century;[27] and then again by Levita in 1538, who describes it as the only separate Massorah.[28] Henceforth it entirely disappeared. Even R. Salmon Norzi, the great Biblical critic, and Massoretic authority (*circa* 1560–1630), who wrote his celebrated critical and Massoretic

---

[23] Comp. Delitzsch, *Catal. Codd. Lips.*, p. 273; and also Zunz, *Additamenta*, to Delitzsch's Catalogue, p. 315, where the passages are given in which Rashi quotes the "Great Massorah."

[24] Hebrew, מסורת הגדולה, מסורה גדולה; Chaldee, מסורתא רבתא, מסורתא רבתי. *Vide supra*, p. 16, &c.

[25] Kimchi quotes the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* in his grammar, entitled *Michlol*, 35 *b*, col. 2; 51*a*, col 2; ed. Levita, Bomberg, 1545, fol.; or 112 *b*, 163 *a*, ed. Hechim. Fürth, 1793; and in his Lexicon, *s. v.*, קרב.

[26] For Ibn Aknin's quotations, which are to be found in his ethical work entitled טב אלנפוס, and in his Methology, see Steinschneider, in Geiger's *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, vol. i., p. 316, note 31, Breslau, 1862.

[27] The work in which Isaac b. Jehudah quotes the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* is entitled ספר האשל. Comp. Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr., in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, col. 1418; the same author in Geiger's *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, vol. i., p. 317, note; Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vol. v., p. 555, note, Magdeburg, 1860; and see also Neubauer, *Notice sur la Lexicographie Hébraiqué*, p. 9. Paris, 1863.

[28] Comp. *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, pp. 93, 94, 138.

Testaments; and Biblical critics have to the present day not succeeded in finding out these materials. Yet who ever thinks of charging the Cardinal, and the editors of the Complutensian Polyglott, with designedly concealing the original sources of their work, in order that it might appear greater than it actually was?

Levita, who, in referring to the extraordinary dimensions of the Massorah magna, tells us that "if all the words of it which he had seen in his life were to be written down, and bound up in a book, it would exceed in bulk the Bible itself," declares that the greater part of Ibn Adonijah's compilation is from the *Ochla Ve-Ochla.*[20] Now Ibn Adonijah does not even mention the name of this Massoretic Compendium; and it would at first sight seem as if we had here one of the original sources, which he had designedly concealed. But the fact that Levita found a copy of this treatise, after great exertions,[21]—though he lived in the very place where Ibn Adonijah sojourned, and was engaged by the very printer who employed Ibn Adonijah, and who collected and possessed all the Codices of the Massorah used in the edition of the Rabbinic Bible, would of itself show that Ibn Adonijah could not have had before him this particular redaction when he compiled the Massorah. Levita's remark, therefore, simply proves that the different redactions of the separate Massorah, or the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, which Ibn Adonijah worked up in his great compilation, also embodied the greater portion contained in the particular redaction in question.

Had the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* referred to by Levita come to light, we should have been able, by comparing it with the present Massorah, to see how much of it Ibn Adonijah incorporated in his compilation, and in what manner he worked up the materials. But, unfortunately, this Codex, like all other Massoretic compilations, has disappeared. There can, however, be no doubt that Levita's statement is exaggerated, and that, from his known enmity to Ibn Adonijah for having embraced Christianity, he would only too readily seize any plausible opportunity of depreciating his fellow-labourer's work. Yet even he was constrained to bestow the greatest praise upon Ibn Adonijah's compilation, and to account for its deficiencies by adducing the ancient proverb that "every beginning is difficult."[22]

The few independent surveys of the Massorah, which have of late transformed it into a Massoretic lexicon, so that the finding of the Massoretic definitions is greatly facilitated. That he had MSS. before him for this work is evident from the whole plan, and especially from his frank confession, in separate articles, that the statements are sometimes contrary in themselves, and sometimes contradict other statements, and that he leaves the solution. However, the bringing together of the separate and scattered stones into a well compacted edifice is his work. The arrangement was uncommonly difficult; he had often to hesitate, in the course of his work, in which to put single articles; and this indeed constituted simply a single and subordinate part in the great work of a complete edition of the Bible, with Targum and a number of Commentaries."

---

[20] *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, p. 138, ed. Ginsburg.

[21] *Ibid*, p. 93.

[22] *Ibid*, p. 95, &c.

From this description, which is irreconcilable with the other, wherein Ibn Adonijah is charged with designed concealment of the original sources, it is almost certain that Geiger could not have read through Jacob b. Chajim's Introduction to the Bible. For here, where Geiger is really anxious to do him justice, and where he alludes to Ibn Adonijah's materials, he simply refers to his remarks in the Massorah finalis, drawing from them his conclusion, and does not at all refer to Ibn Adonijah's Introduction, where he most explicitly states that he had before him separate Codices of the Massorah. That he does not specify these Codices, is owing to the fact that the several redactions of the survey of the Massorah, and the fragmentary nature of many of the Codices, precluded such a bibliographical description. Besides, paleographical and bibliographical descriptions of MSS., used in editing a work, belong to modern days. The editors of the greatest works, after the invention of printing, and in the days of Ibn Adonijah, never thought of giving an account of the materials they used up. Cardinal Ximenes, and his co-workers at the magnificent edition of the Complutensian Polyglott, gave no account whatsoever of the materials and MSS. they used for the texts of the Old and New

iſt aus der ganzen Anlage erſichtlich, beſonders daraus, daß er unumwunden zu einzelnen Artikeln bekennt, daß die Angaben bald in ſich ſelbſt bald mit andern im Widerſpruch ſtehn, und er die Löſung anheimſtellt. Allein die Zuſammenſchichtung der einzelnen zerſtreuten Bauſteine zu einem wohlgefügten Bau iſt ſein Werk. Die Anordnuug war ungemein ſchwierig, er mußte oft ſchwanken, an welcher Stelle er den einzelnen Artikel unterbringen ſolle, im Loufe der Arbeit ſelbſt—und dieſelbe ſchloß ſich ja blos als einzelner untergeordneter Theil an das große Werk einer vollſtändigen Bibelausgabe mit Thargum und einer Anzahl Commentare an—änderte er zuweilen ſeinen Plan. *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, vol. iii., p. 105.

whether he had before him one or more such compilations, nay, on the contrary, it seems as if he claimed for himself this compilation," and then charge Ibn Adonijah with designedly concealing his original sources, is to us a matter of the utmost astonishment. Can it be that Geiger has not read through Ibn Adonijah's Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, in which he gives this detailed description of his labours?

The imputation appears still more unaccountable when it is compared with the correct account which a few pages before Geiger gives of Ibn Adonijah's most assiduous and *conscientious* work. "Jacob b. Chajim," he says,[19*] "has the great merit of having transmitted to us the Massorah, in the second Bomberg Bible, edited by him (1525), after comparing it most carefully with different MSS. He has furnished us with a work of the utmost discernment and indescribable industry. He has used several MSS. for the Massorah parva and magna, endeavoured to reconcile and solve contradictions and difficulties; and has conscientiously given an account of this, as well as of his scruples. He must certainly have had before him a Massoretic survey, but this he has entirely recast in its arrangement. By his not only referring frequently in the large marginal Massorah to articles in the survey, but, *vice versa*, being sometimes satisfied with a reference in the latter to the former, he actually also endeavoured to make it a complete survey, inasmuch as he has tried to work up the whole Massoretic material, in so far as it did not relate to entirely isolated details; and moreover, by arranging it alphabetically, he has only thought to ornament their writing, and to make even lines, so as not to alter the appearance, in order that all the pages should be alike. Moreover they ornamented them with illuminations of divers kinds of buds, flowers, &c. Hence they were obliged sometimes to narrow, and sometimes to widen, the margins round the illuminations with words already stated, although they were superfluous, and out of place; whilst the Massoretic registers were entirely omitted from their proper place, because the space did not suffice; and hence they had to break off in the middle of a sentence, thus leaving the whole edifice incomplete, and greatly defective.[18*]

[19*] Jakob ben Chajim hat das große Verdienſt, uns dieſelbe in der von ihm beſorgten Ausgabe der zweiten rabbiniſchen Bomberg'ſchen Bibel (1525), mit ſorgfältiger Vergleichung verſchiedener Handſchriften, überliefert zu haben. Er hat uns ein Werk einſichtsvoller Kenntniß und unſäglichen Fleißes geliefert; er hat für die kleine und die große Maßorah mehrere Handſchriften benützt, Differenzen und Schwierigkeiten auszugleichen und zu löſen geſucht, und gewiſſenhaft giebt er darüber wie über ſeine Skrupel Bericht. Auch die maßorethiſche Ueberſicht lag ihm ſicherlich vor; dieſe aber arbeitete er in Betreff der Anordnung vollſtändig um. Nicht blos daß er in der großen Randmaßorah häufig auf Artikel der Ueberſicht verwies, umgekehrt zuweilen in dieſer ſich mit einer Verweiſung auf die große Randmaßorah degnügte, hat er ſie auch wirklich zn einer vollſtändigen Ueberſicht zu geſtalten verſucht, indem er den ganzen maßorethiſchhen Stoff, ſoweit er nicht ganz vereinzeltes Detail betraſ, darin zu verarbeiten ſuchte' und daß er ſie ferner alfabetiſch ordnete, ſie alſo zu einem maßorethiſchen Lexikon umgeſtaltete, das die Auffindung der maßorethiſchhen Beſtimmungen ſehr erleichterte. Daß ihm Handſchriften zu dieſer Arbeit vorlagen,

Thus much for the Massorah, which accompanied the Codices of the Bible, prior to, and after, the time of Ibn Adonijah's compilation. As to the means for collating, correcting, and compiling it, and the extent of his labours, he distinctly tells us that he used different separate redactions of the Massorah, which Bomberg procured, and which he himself possessed. Here, again, we must let Ibn Adonijah speak for himself. "Now," says he, "when I observed all this confusion, I bestirred myself in the first place to arrange all the Massoretic notes, according to the verses to which they belonged; and then to investigate the Massoretic treatises in my possession, apart from what was written in the margins of the Bibles. Wherever an omission or contraction occurred, in order to obtain even lines, or four lines at the top and five lines at the bottom, I at once consulted the Massoretic treatises, and corrected it according to order. And whenever I found that the Massoretic treatises differed from each other, I put down the opinions of both sides, as will be found in the margin of our edition of the Bible with the Massorah, the word in dispute being marked to indicate that it is not the language of the Massorah; and whenever I took exception to the statement in a certain Codex of the Massorah, because it did not harmonise with the majority of the Codices of the Massorah, whilst it agreed with a few, or wherever it contradicted itself, I made careful search till I discovered the truth, according to my humble knowledge."[19]

How, in the face of such a plain declaration, that he had used sundry Codices of the Massorah, apart from the Massorah which accompanied the copies of the Bible, an accurate and profound scholar like Geiger could say—"from his words it does not appear the Bible, thus constituting what is called the Massorah parva and the Massorah marginalis; and second, separate Massoretic Treatises, or the different redactions of what is called the *Ochla Ve-Ochla.*

[18*] *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, p. 94, ed. Ginsburg, Longmans, 1867.

[19] *Vide infra*, p. 79, &c.

Equally explicit and straightforward are his remarks about the nature of these materials, and the manner in which he elaborated them. We cannot do better than give his own description of the condition of the Massorahs, written in the margins of the Bibles. "After mastering their contents," he says, "I found them in the utmost disorder and confusion, so much so, that there is not a sentence to be found without a blunder: that is to say, the quotations from the Massorites are both incorrect and misplaced; since in those codices in which the Massorah is written in the margin, it is not arranged according to the order of the verses contained in the page. Thus, for instance, if a page has five or six verses, the first of which begins with וַיֹּאמֶר, *and he said;* the second with וַיֻּגַּד, *and it was told;* the third with וְזֶה, *and it is;* the fourth with וַיִּשְׁלַח, *and he sent;* the fifth with וַתֵּשֶׁב, *and she sat;* the Massorah commences with the fourth verse, "the word וַיִּשְׁלַח, occurs twenty-two times;" then follows verse two, "the word וַיֻּגַּד, occurs twenty-four times;" and then the fifth verse, "the word וַתֵּשֶׁב, occurs fifteen times," without any order or plan. Moreover, most of these [Massoretic remarks] are written in a contracted form, and with ornaments; so much so, that they cannot at all be deciphered, as the desire of the writer was only to embellish his writing, and not to examine or to understand the sense. Thus, for instance, in most of the copies, there are four lines [of the Massorah] on the top of the page, and five at the bottom, as the writer would under no circumstances diminish or increase the number. Hence, whenever there happened to be any of the alphabetical lists, or if the Massoretic remarks were lengthy, he split up the remarks in the middle or at the beginning, and largely introduced abbreviations, so as to obtain even lines." [18]

That this is by no means an exaggerated description of the state in which the Massorah, written in the margins of the Bible, was in the days of Ibn Adonijah, may be seen from the account given by Levita, his contemporary and co-labourer in the same department. Levita, who fourteen years later (1538) had to collate it for his Introduction to the Massorah, says, "as for the Massorah, written round the margin in the Codices, it contains numberless errors. The copyists have perverted it, as they did not care for the Massorah, but text, is exclusively his work. From his words, with which he introduces this work, it does not appear whether he had before him one or more such compilations, nay, on the contrary, it seems as if he claimed for himself this compilation. We can scarcely avoid the suspicion, that the man, whose merit is at all events to be acknowledged as permanent, designedly intended to envelope it in darkness, with the artificial words in which he introduces this work, as well as the grammatical Treatise of Moses Ha-Nakden, in order that it might scarcely be guessed what he had originally before him, and that it should be supposed that he had done far more at it than is actually the case; on the contrary, he would surely have increased his merit if he had told very plainly what sources he used, in what form they were, and how he had worked them up. Nevertheless he omitted to give this information, and the most distinguished literati and collators of MSS. could give no information whether there existed any MS. compilation of the Massorah."

---

[18] *Vide infra*, p. 78, &c.

That this accusation is unmerited, may be seen both from Jacob Ibn Adonijah's Introduction, and from the various notes which he made in different parts of the Massorah finalis. Thus in the passage already quoted,[17] he not only tells us that Bomberg despatched messengers to different countries to search for copies of the Massorah, but distinctly declares that they succeeded in obtaining as many codices as could possibly be secured. These Massorahs, he moreover says, embraced both kinds: First, the Massorahs written in the margin of

---

Waßorah's vorgenommen, ausſchließlich ſein Werk ſei. Ans ſeinen Worten, mit denen er dieſe Arbeit einleitet, geht nicht hervor, ob er eine oder gar mehrere ſolcher Ueberſichten vorliegen gehabt habe, ja es ſcheint im Gegentheile, als nehme er dieſe Zuſammenſtellung für ſich allein in Anſpruch; wir können uns kaum des Verdachtes erwehren, daß der Mann, deſſen Verdienſt jedenfalls ein dauernd anzuerkennendes iſt, durch die künſtlichen Worte, mit denen er dieſes Werk, wie das grammatiſche des Moſes ha-Nakdan, einleitet, abſichtlich ein gewiſſes Halbdunkel darüber verbreiten wollte, ſo daß man, was ihm urſprünglich vorgelegen, kaum ahnen könne und man auf die Vermuthung kommen ſolle, er habe weit mehr dabei gethan, als wirklich der Fall iſt. Sicher hätte er ſein Verdienſt im Gegentheile erhöht, wenn er uns recht genau geſagt hätte, welche Quellen er benützt, welche Geſtalt dieſelben gehabt und wie er ſie verarbeitet. Jedoch er unterließ dieſe Mittheilung, und die bedeutendſten Kenner und Handſchriftenſammler wußten von der maßorethiſchen Ueberſicht, ob ſie handſchriftlich vorhanden ſei, keine Nachricht zu geben. *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben*, vol. iii., p. 112, &c. Breslau, 1865.

[17] *Vide supra*, p. 8, &c.

and once with *Vav*, with which the Massorah begins.[15] It must be remarked, however, that in copying the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, or the Massorah, the scribes or students did not always transcribe the whole of it. Some portions were omitted as being unimportant, or not being wanted by the transcriber; some were transposed by the students to facilitate reference; whilst other portions were added by those who devoted themselves to this kind of study. Hence obtained different redactions, some called by the general name *Massoretic Treatises*, and others by the more specific appellation *Ochla Ve-Ochla;* hence the difficulty of ascertaining the particular redaction meant by the different commentators, lexicographers, and grammarians, who quote the *Ochla Ve-Ochla;* and hence too the impossibility of specifying particularly the various nameless fragments and forms of the Massorah, used for collation in the compilation of this critico-exegetical apparatus, as edited by Ibn Adonijah.

This impossibility of specifying the nameless fragments, which Jacob Ibn Adonijah realised in the compilation of the Massorah, has recently been construed into a deliberate suppression of the materials which he used, and the sources whence he drew his information. Thus Geiger, in showing the importance of the Massorah to Biblical criticism, and deploring its neglect by commentators and lexicographers, remarks,[16] "Acquaintance with the Massorah, and with the numerous MSS. which contain it in its various forms, has for centuries become so rare, that people did not at all know any more whether the Massorah actually existed in former times, in the form of a comprehensive view, or whether it has been made into such a form for the first time by Jacob b. Chajim, at the end of his edition of the Bible; and whether this whole compilation which he made from the isolated Massorahs, both parva and magna, to be found connected immediately with the absence of concordances precluded the possibility of discovering at once all the instances in which certain anomalies were to be found, the continued exertions of the Massorites resulted, not only in supplementing and completing the already existing rubrics, but in adding new registers and lists of words, forms, phrases, and combinations, which exhibited the slightest deviation from the ordinary usage. Hence the Massorah, in its present development, embraces almost everything connected with the external appearance of the text. It gives the number of times each letter of the alphabet occurs throughout the Bible. It states how many verses there are in each separate book. It shows which is the middle letter, which the middle word, and which is the middle verse in every book. It registers the majuscular, the minuscular, the inverted, the suspended, and the peculiarly pointed letters, the anomalous forms and phrases, defective and plene, textual and marginal readings, conjectural readings, lexical features, &c.

---

[15] Levita, who made the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* the basis of his Massoretic researches, plainly declared that it is so called from its beginning words, הנקרא כן בעבור התחלהו; *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, p. 131. We cannot, therefore, understand why the learned Dr. Steinschneider should be so anxious to claim the originality of this remark. Comp. Geiger's *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, vol. i., pp. 316, 317, note 31, Breslau, 1862.

[16] Die Bekanntſchaft mit ihr, mit den zahlreichen Handſchriften, welche ſie in ihrer verſchiedenen Geſtalt enthalten, iſt ſchon ſeit Jahrhunderten ſo ſpärlich geworden, daß man gar nicht mehr wußte, ob denn wirklich früher auch die Maßorah in der Geſtalt einer umfaſſenden Ueberſicht exiſtirt habe, oder ob ſie ſo erſt von Jakob ben Chajim am Ende der Bibelausgabe geordnet worden, dieſe ganze Zuſammenſtellung, die er eben aus den vereinzelten unmittelbar neben dem Texte befindlichen kleinen und großen

When the Massorah began to be written down, it assumed a double form. The first form of it is more like an index, simply stating alongside the margin, against the word which exhibits a certain peculiarity, that the word in question is one of such and such a number, possessing the same peculiarity, without giving the other words of the same rubric. This form assumed the name of *Massorah parva* (מסורה קטנה). The second is the more extensive form. It not only gives all the words which possess the same peculiarity in full, but adds a few words, by which each expression is preceded, or followed, so as to enable the student to recognise, from the connection, in what book the anomaly occurs. This form of it obtained the name of *Massorah magna*, and is written above and below the text.

As, however, the Massorah constantly increased in bulk in the course of time, extending to every phenomenon of the text, and as the large dimensions it assumed precluded the possibility of its being written entirely above and below the margin of the page to which it referred, the different lists, both alphabetical and otherwise, had to be arranged according to alphabetical or other order, and chronicled in separate works. These books are either called by the general name *Massoretic Treatises* (ספרי המסרה), or *Ochla Ve-Ochla* (אכלה ואכלה). The latter appellation the Massoretic Treatises obtained from the first two examples, אָכְלָה (1 Sam. i. 9), וְאָכְלָה (Gen. xxvii. 19), in the alphabetical list of words occurring twice in the Bible, once without repetition of a phrase, or the peculiarity of a construction, the greatest care has been taken, since the beginning of the Christian era, to mark every peculiarity and phenomenon in the spelling and construction of the words in the Scriptures, so that " one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law."

The duty of noting these peculiarities devolved more especially upon the Scribes, or copyists, who multiplied the Codices of the Bible.[12] As the collation of MSS. for the purpose of producing correct copies was deemed unsafe, inasmuch as the multiplication always gives rise to a multitude of errors ; and as, moreover, the process of collation is not only tedious, but demands a number of MSS. belonging to different families, and various ages, the Scribes found it more practicable to count the number of times a word was spelled in an exceptional way, or a peculiar phrase was used, or any anomaly occurred throughout the Bible. The different peculiarities, thus numbered, were rubricated, and formed into separate registers and lists. These were at first committed to memory by the professional Scribes and doctors of the law, and transmitted orally in the schools ; but afterwards, like all other traditions, were written down, and now constitute the *Massorah* (מסורה), = *tradition.*[13]

Like the science of grammar and lexicography, the Massoretic researches were at first limited. They were confined to the rubrication of words and phrases to which some legal enactment was attached, or which had some caligraphical and orthographical peculiarity. But as the Massoretic schools extended over a millennium,[14] and as the correction and annotation, it was the best trade policy to suppress the name of the converted Jew. Hence Fürst may be perfectly correct in his supposition that Jacob b. Chajim had a share in preparing for the press the fifteen important works already alluded to, though the learned bibliographer neither accounts for, nor mentions, the fact that Ibn Adonijah's name is suppressed.

---

[12] Hence the remark, לפיכך נקראי הראשונים סופרים שהיו סופרים כל האותיות שבתורה שהיו אומרים וא׳ו דגחון חציין של אותיות של ספר תורה, דרש דרש חציין של תיבות, והתגלח של פסוקים, יכרסמנה חזיר מיער עי׳ן דיער חציים של תהלים, והוא רחום יכפר עון חצוי דפסוקים: " therefore are the ancients called Sopherim, because they counted all the letters in Holy Writ. Thus they said that the *Vav*, in גחון [Levit. xi. 42], is the half of all the letters in the Pentateuch ; דרש דרש [*ibid.* x. 16] is the middle word ; והתגלח [*ibid.* xiii. 33] the middle verse ; that *Ain*, in מיער [Ps. lxxx. 14], is the middle letter in the Psalms ; and Ps. lxxvii. 38 the middle verse." *Kiddushin*, 30 *a*.

[13] The expression מסורה, which now denotes all the labours of the Massorites effected during a millennium, is the post-Talmudic form. In the Talmud it is מָסוֹרֶת and originally denoted *the traditional pronunciation* of the unpointed text. Thus it was transmitted authoritatively that שבעים (Levit. xii. 5) is to be read שְׁבֻעַיִם, *two weeks*, and not שִׁבְעִים, *seventy days ;* and that בחלב (Exod. xxiii. 19) is to be pronounced בַּחֲלֵב, *in the milk*, and not בְּחֵלֶב, *in the fat*. Comp. Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, vol. i., p. 90, &c. ; vol. iii., p. 79.

[14] This has already been pointed out by Levita ; comp. *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, p. 137, ed. Ginsburg.

The precise year in which Ibn Adonijah died has not as yet been ascertained, though it is perfectly certain, from the remarks of Levita already alluded to, that he departed this life before 1538. That the Jews did not record anything connected with his life and death is no matter of surprise, when we remember that he had left their community, and that, in their unparalleled sufferings, the converted Israelites of those days, in their blind zeal, were considerable abettors. But that the Christian writers of those days, both Catholics and Protestants, who thought it worth their while to chronicle and perpetuate events which we cannot read now without blushing, should have passed over in total silence the death of one who had done so much for Biblical literature, and suffered the loss of all things to join the ranks of the followers of Christ, will remain an indelible blot on the gratitude of Christian historians. As far as Ibn Adonijah himself is concerned, he has left a monument behind him in his contributions to Biblical literature, which will last as long as the Bible is studied in the original; and the critical student of the Scriptures can never examine the Massorah, nor look at the gigantic Rabbinic Bible, without feelings of reverence for, and gratitude to, Jacob b. Chajim Ibn Adonijah, who, being dead, yet speaketh.

It now remains that we should advert to the materials from which Ibn Adonijah compiled the Massorah, and to the merits of his compilation. Before, however, this is done, it is necessary to give the reader some idea of the origin, development, import, and transmission of the Massorah. The account must necessarily be very succinct.

Owing to the extreme sacredness with which the letter of the text was regarded, and believing that the multifarious legal enactments which were called forth by the ever-shifting circumstances of the commonwealth, the sacred legends which developed themselves in the course of time, and all the ecclesiastical and civil regulations, to which an emergency may at any time give rise, are indicated in the Bible by a superfluous letter, or redundant word, or the could his soul long ago be bound up (*i. e.* have departed) in the year 1538, when the *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth* was printed? But when I saw the edition of the Mishna in question, I thought, what am I now to say? and how am I to reconcile it? Surely upon the testimony of two witnesses the man must be executed. Whereupon I concluded that Ibn Adonijah wrote his Treatise on the Targum when still a Jew, and that it had either been already printed when he was alive, in an edition of the Pentateuch which I have not yet seen, or it was not printed in his life-time, but remained for some years in the possession of Daniel Bomberg, till he printed an edition of the Pentateuch, with the Targum, when he also printed at the end the Treatise in question."

This fact may perhaps give us the clue to Jacob Ibn Adonijah's sudden disappearance from the field of labour in connection with Bomberg's printing office. The apology of the second editor of the edition of the Mishna in question, for printing, in a work intended for the Jews, opinions propounded by one who had ceased to be a member of the community, seems to imply several things which have hitherto been unknown in connection with the life of Ibn Adonijah. We see from it—i. That he still continued to work for Bomberg after he embraced Christianity. For had Ibn Adonijah revised the Tractate of Mishna in question when he was still a Jew, the future editor would not have found it necessary to apologise for reprinting Ibn Adonijah's opinions; just as the future editors of the Rabbinic Bible did not require to explain why they reprinted his compilation of the Massorah, and the Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, which he wrote when still a Jew. ii. The fact that Bomberg's works were for the Jews, and that an apology was needed to be made to them for printing the corrections and annotations made by a converted Jew, would of itself show the inexpediency of retaining a Jewish Christian on such works. To conciliate, therefore, the prejudice of his Jewish customers, Bomberg was undoubtedly obliged to part with his old friend Jacob Ibn Adonijah. How bitter this prejudice was against those who embraced Christianity, may be seen from the vituperations uttered against Ibn Adonijah, even by so enlightened a man as Elias Levita. If our conclusions are correct, they will also supply us with the clue to the sudden and mysterious disappearance of Ibn Adonijah's name from nearly all the books printed by Bomberg since the year 1527. However much Ibn Adonijah may have done to them by way of the poetical Introduction to the *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, ‘one of the learned, whose name was formerly, among the Jews, Jacob. Let his soul be bound up in a bag with holes;’ and your asking me whether I believe it to imply that R. Jacob b. Chajim Ibn Adonijah changed his religion; it is assuredly so. This was the reason why I delayed replying to your letter, for I was greatly perplexed about this subject; since for a truth, from the import of R. Elias Levita's words in question, it is beyond doubt that R. Jacob changed his religion, and I was unwilling to publish this strange report about such a learned man till I found another witness. Now last year, one of my friends, the erudite R. Moses Soave, of Venice, found an edition of the Mishna, with the Commentaries of Maimonides and Shimshon b. Abraham, printed at Venice (Giustiniani), 1546; at the end of Tractate *Taharoth* was written as follows, which I also saw myself with my own eyes: ‘These are the words of the first editor, whose name was formerly, among the Jews, Jacob b. Chajim, and who revised the Tractate *Taharoth*, with the Commentary of R. Shimshon, of blessed memory. Since, however, the sage said, ‘Receive the truth by whomsoever it is propounded,’ we deemed it proper to print his remarks here.’ Now is peradventure the lie to be given also to this testimony, or is the fact to be established from this witness?

“Before this, however, happened, I rejoiced as one that findeth great spoil, for I bought a copy of the Pentateuch, with the Targum, printed by Bomberg in 1543–44, at the end of which are seven pages on the Targum, beginning—‘Thus saith Jacob b. Chajim b. Isaac Ibn Adonijah,’ &c.; as I thought from this it is evident that in the years 1543–44 he was alive, and was still a Jew; and how then

הייתי נבוך בענין הזה, כי אמנם משמעות דברי ר׳ אליה הנ״ל היא בלא ספק כי ר׳ יעקב המיר דתו, ולא הייתי רוצה להוציא לעז על הכם כמהו בטרם אשמע עד שני. ואולם בשנה שעברה מצא אחד מידידי המשכיל ר׳ משה סואבי מעיר ויניציאה משניות עם פירוש הר״מ והר״ש דפוס ויניציאה (יוסטיניאן) שנת ש״ו, ובסוף סדר טהרות כתוב כך (וכן ראיתי גם אני בעיני) ״ואלה הם דברי המגיה הראשון שהיה שמו לפנים בישראל יעקב בר חיים שהגיה סדר טהרות עם פירוש רבינו שמשון ז״ל. ולפי שאמר החכם קבל האמת ממי שאמרו ראינו להדפיס דבריו פה״ — היתכן להכזיב גם העדות הזאת, או להוציאה ממשמעות דבריה:

ואני קודם לכן ששתי כמוצא שלל רב כי קניתי חומש עם תרגום דפוס בומבירג שנת ש״ג וש״ד ובסופו ז׳ דפים על התרגום, תחלתם ״אמר יעקב בן חיים בן יצחק ן׳ אדניהו יש״י עמה״ן״ ואמרתי הרי מבואר כי בשנת ש״ג וש״ד היה חי והיה יהודי, ואיך בשנת רצ״ח (כשנדפס ס׳ מסרת המסרת) כבר היתה נשמתו צרורה? — אבל כשראיתי המשניות הנ״ל, אמרתי מה אדבר? ובמה אצידקהו? הלא על פי שנים עדים יומת המת ואז אמרת: אין ספק כי ן׳ אדניהו כתב מאמרו על התרגום כשהיה יהודי, ואולי כבר נדפס בחייו בחומש אחר שלא בא עדיין לידי, ואולי ג״כ לא נדפס בחייו, אבל נשאר ביד דניאל בומבירג קצת שנים, עד שהדפיס חומש עם תרגום ואז הדפיס המאמר ההוא בסופו. This letter is published in the Hebrew Essays and Reviews, entitled *Ozar Nechanad*, vol iii., p. 112, Vienna, 1860.

been connected with them, Jacob's name is not even mentioned. This, however, may be owing to the change in Ibn Adonijah's religious sentiments, which, as we shall presently see, is more than probable.

The disappearance of Jacob Ibn Adonijah from the field of active labour in connection with Bomberg, which happened almost simultaneously with the arrival of Levita at Venice, and his appointment as corrector and annotator of the Hebrew works, is most significant, and we believe that it was caused by Ibn Adonijah's relinquishing Judaism.

It is now established beyond the shadow of a doubt, that this eminent Hebraist embraced Christianity about this time. Levita, who had occasion to refer to Adonijah, when writing his exposition of the Massorah (*circa* 1537–38), not only speaks of him as dead, but intimates that he had avowed the Christian faith some considerable time before he departed this life, and hence descends to unworthy vituperations against him. Referring to the Massorah, edited by Ibn Adonijah, in the celebrated Rabbinic Bible, Levita says, "I have not seen anything like it among all the ancient books, for arrangement and correctness, for beauty and excellence, and for good order. The compiler thereof was one of the learned, whose name was formerly, among the Jews, Jacob. Let his soul be bound up in a bag with holes!"[10] This spiteful perversion of a beautiful, charitable, and reverential prayer, which the Jews use when speaking of or writing about any one of their brethren who has departed this life, in allusion to 1 Sam. xxv. 29, justifies us in assuming that Jacob Ibn Adonijah embraced Christianity several years before 1537.

As the statement in question, in Levita's work, was till lately the only reference to Ibn Adonijah's having embraced Christianity towards the end of his life, the fact was generally unknown, and many of the learned Jews doubted whether the passage in Levita really meant to convey the idea. Amongst those who doubted it, was the erudite Frensdorff. He therefore wrote to the late Professor Luzzatto, asking him the meaning of the passage in question, to which he replied as follows:[11] "As to the meaning of Levita's words, which he wrote in

---

[10] אכן המסורת מהארבע ועשרים, הנדפסות הנה, לא ראיתי כהנה, בכל ספרי הקדמונים, מסודרים ומתוקנים, ביופי ובהדור, ובטוב הסדור, סדרם אחד מהנבונים, היה שמו לפנים, בישראל נקרא יעקב, תהי נשמתו צרורה בצרור נקוב. Comp. *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, p. 94, ed. Ginsburg.

[11] ולענין דברי הבחור שכתב בהקדמתו החרוזית למסורת המסורת ״אחד מהנבונים היה שמו לפנים בישראל נקרא יעקב, תהי נשמתו צרורה בצרור נקוב״ ששאלת אם אאמין שכוונתו לומר שר׳ יעקב בר חיים ן׳ אדניהו המיר דתו — ודאי כן הוא. והדבר הזה היה סבה שנמנעתי מהשיב למכתבך, כי הרבה

It is more than probable that Levita told Jacob Ibn Adonijah of the Aramaic work on which he was engaged, the MS. of which he lost in the sacking of Rome, and that this exercised some influence on the latter in the choice of his next literary undertaking. For we find Jacob Ibn Adonijah, immediately after Levita's arrival, writing "*A Treatise on the Targum*" (מאמר על התרגום). It is a matter of dispute whether this Treatise first appeared in Bomberg's edition of the Pentateuch and the Five Megilloth, published in 1527, or in that published in 1543–44, after Jacob Ibn Adonijah's death.[8] Not possessing the editions in question, I cannot state which opinion is the correct one.

Although no one who is at all acquainted with his assiduity, and who knows what an uncontrollable and inextinguishable passion to continue therein is kindled in the hearts of those who have embarked upon authorship and found their works acceptable, will for a moment doubt that Jacob Ibn Adonijah ever would relinquish his literary pursuits, as long as he possessed his faculties and the use of his limbs; yet, with the exception of one solitary and incidental reference to his work, presently to be mentioned, we henceforth hear nothing more about his productions. Fürst indeed enumerates no less than fifteen important Midrashim and Commentaries on the Bible, which Bomberg published in 1543–47, and which he says may have been prepared for the press by our author.[9] But this is mere conjecture. I myself possess the very editions of some of the works in question, and though Cornelius Adelkind and Elias Levita are distinctly stated as having

---

[8] Comp. the article *Jüdische Typographie*, by Steinschneider and David Cassel, in Ersch and Gruber's *Allgemeine Encyklopädie*, section II., vol. xxviii., p. 44, note 32, and Professor Luzzatto's Letter (reprinted below, p. 11), and with Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, vol. iii., p. 451.

[9] The works referred to are as follows:—*Midrash Rabboth* (מדרש רבות), Venice, 1545, fol.; *Mechilta* (מכלתא), *ibid.* 1545, fol.; *Siphra* (ספרא), *ibid.* 1545, fol.; *Siphre* (ספרי), *ibid.* 1545, fol.; *Midrash Tanchuma* (מדרש תנחומא), *ibid.* 1545, fol.; *Midrash Tilim* (מדרש תלים), *ibid.* 1546, fol.; *Pisikta Sutratha* (פסקתא זושרתא), *ibid.* 1546, fol.; Elias Mishrachi's *Supra Commentary* on Rashi's Comment. on the Pentateuch, called *Sepher Ha-Mizrache* (ספר מזרחי), *ibid.* 1545, fol.; Arama's Commentary on the Pentateuch, called *Akedath*, (עקדה), *ibid.* 1547, fol.; Ralbag's *Commentary on the Pentateuch* (רל״בג על התורה), *ibid.* 1547, fol.; Abraham Sabba's *Kabbalistic Commentary on the Pentateuch*, entitled *Tzeror Ha-Mor* (צרור המור), *ibid.* 1546, fol.; Nachmanides' *Commentary on the Pentateuch* (על רמ״בן התורה), *ibid.* 1548, fol.; Ibn Shemtob's *Homiletical Commentarg on the Pentateuch* (דרשות התורה לבזמ״ב), *ibid.* 1547, fol.; Jacob Ibn Chibib's *Collection of Hagodas*, called *En Jacob* (עי עקב), *ibid.* 1546, fol.; R. Solomon b. Abraham b. Aderethe's *Theological Answers to Queries* (ש״ות הרש״בא), *ibid.* 1545-6, fol.; R. Moses de Corecy's Homiletical work, entitled, *The Major Book on the Commandments* (סמ״ג), *ibid.* 1547, fol. (Comp. *Bibliotheca Judaica*, vol. iii. p. 452.)

Roman Catholic country, when Luther began to make his voice heard in defence of the word of God. Thus it is, that we in the present day are still left to the labours of Jacob b. Chajim, though the results of modern researches, and the discovery of valuable MSS., would enable us to issue a new edition of the critical apparatus of the Old Testament, with important corrections and additions, and in a form more easily accessible to Biblical students.

Bomberg, who took the liveliest interest and the greatest pride in this magnificent edition of the Bible, got Elias Levita, whose fame as a Hebraist was at that time spread not only all over Italy where he resided, but over Germany, both among the most distinguished dignitaries in the Catholic Church and the great leaders of the Reformation, to write an epilogue to the work of his ambition. In this poem, Levita celebrates the praises of the munificent publisher, "who though uncircumcised in the flesh [*i. e.*, a gentile], is circumcised in heart," of "the learned Jacob Ibn Adonijah," who carried it through the press, and of the unparalleled work itself.[7] Levita was then residing at Rome, in the house of his friend and patron, Cardinal Egidio de Viterbo, where he was diligently engaged in printing his works on the grammar and structure of the Hebrew language, teaching the Roman Catholic and Protestant combatants the original of the Old Testament, and enjoying the literary society of popes, cardinals, princes, ambassadors, and warriors, who were bewitched by the mysteries of the Kabbalah, and little thinking of the misfortunes which were soon to befall him.

Within two years of his writing the epilogue to Jacob Ibn Adonijah's Rabbinic Bible, and whilst engaged on an Aramaic grammar, the Imperialists under Charles V. sacked Rome (May 6, 1527), and in the general work of spoliation and destruction, Levita lost all his property and the greater part of his MSS. In a most destitute and deplorable condition, he left the Eternal city, and betook himself to Venice in the same year (1527); and Bomberg, at whose request he had written the epilogue, at once engaged him as joint corrector of the press and as editor. Thus the two learned Hebraists, Jacob b. Chajim and Elias Levita, who were the great teachers of Hebrew to the greatest men of Europe, at the commencement and during the development of the Reformation, now became co-workers in the same printing office.

---

[7] For the different editions of the Bible, and for the alterations which were afterwards made in it, see Kitto's *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*, *s.v.* Rabbinic Bibles.

sentence, to form an adequate conception of the extraordinary labour and learning which Jacob Ibn Adonijah must have bestowed, in bringing such beautiful order out of such a chaos. His modesty and humility, in speaking of the toil, are becoming his vast erudition.

"Behold," he says, "I have exerted all my might and strength to collate and arrange the Massorah, with all the possible improvements, in order that it may remain pure and bright, and shew its splendour to the nations and princes; for, indeed, it is beautiful to look at. This was a labour of love, for the benefit of our brethren, the children of Israel, and for the glory of our holy and perfect law; as well as to fulfil, as far as possible, the desire of Don Daniel Bomberg, whose expenses in this matter far exceeded my labours. And as regards the Commentaries, I have exerted my powers to the utmost degree to correct in them all the mistakes as far as possible; and whatsoever my humble endeavours could accomplish was done for the glory of the Lord, and for the benefit of our people. I would not be deterred by the enormous labour, for which cause I did not suffer my eyelids to be closed long, either in the winter or summer, and did not mind rising in the cold of the night, as my aim and desire were to see this holy work finished. Now praised be the Creator, who granted me the privilege to begin and to finish this work."[6*] Such is the touching account which Jacob b. Chajim gives us of his labour of love.

Not less striking is the gratitude which he expresses to Bomberg, for having so cheerfully and liberally embarked upon so expensive a work. "When I explained to Bomberg," he tells us, "the advantage of the Massorah, he did all in his power to send into all the countries in order to search out what may be found of the Massorah; and, praised be the Lord, we obtained as many of the Massoretic books as could possibly be got. He was not backward, and his hand was not closed, nor did he draw back his right hand from producing gold out of his purse, to defray the expenses of the books, and of the messengers who were engaged to make search for them in the most remote corners, and in every place where they might possibly be found."[7*]

With all our abuse of the Roman Catholics for withholding the Bible from the people, and with all our boasted love for the Scriptures, neither will the Bible Society with its annual income of £80,000, nor will any publisher in this Protestant country of ours, undertake a revised edition of that stupendous work which was published in a

[6*] *Vide infra*, p. 83, &c.

[7*] *Vide infra*, p. 77, &c.

and the Minor Prophets, the Massorah parva, and the Massorah marginalis.

IV. *The fourth volume*, comprising the Hagiographa (כתובים), *i.e.*, the Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles, has the Hebrew text; the so-called Chaldee paraphrases of Joseph the Blind; the Commentaries of Rashi, which only embrace the Psalms, the Five Megilloth (*i. e.*, Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther), Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles; the Commentaries of Ibn Ezra, which only embrace the Psalms, Job, the Five Megilloth, and Daniel; the Commentaries of David Kimchi on the Psalms and Chronicles; the Commentaries of Moses Kimchi on Proverbs, Ezra, and Nehemiah;[6] the Commentaries of Levi ben Gershon on Proverbs and Job; the so-called Commentary of Saadia on Daniel; the Massorah parva, the Massorah marginalis, and the (תרגום שני) Second Targum on Esther. Appended to this volume are—i. The Massorah, for which space could not be found in the margin of the text in alphabetical order, and which is therefore called the Massorah finalis, with Jacob ben Chajim's directions. ii. A Treatise on the Points and Accents of the Hebrew Scriptures, embodying the work (דרכי הניקור והנגינות or כללי הניקוד) of Moses the Punctuator (ר׳ משה הנקדן). iii. The variations between the Western and Eastern Codices, or between the Jerusalem and Babylonian MSS., called חלופין שבין מערבאי ומדנחאי or חלוף המקרא שבין בני ארץ ישראל ובין בני בבל. And iv. The variations between Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali, called חלופי התורה שבין בני אשר ובין בני נפתלי.

It is perfectly impossible for any one, but those students who have seen the MSS. of the Hebrew Bible, with the Massorah round the margin, in a most fantastic manner, who have encountered the difficulties in deciphering the hieroglyphic signs, the conceited abbreviations, the strange forms and ornaments into which the writing of the Massorah is twisted, the confusion of the Massoretic notes, &c.; and who have grappled with the blunders which are to be found in almost every which would of itself more than occupy the whole time of ordinary mortals in the present day, was simply the recreation of Jacob b. Chajim; and that the real strength of his intellect, and the vast stores of his learning, were employed at that very time in collecting and collating MSS. of the Massorah, and in preparing for the press the Rabbinic Bible, which is still a precious monument to his vast erudition and almost unparalleled industry, and which was the most powerful auxiliary to the then commencing Reformation. This Rabbinic Bible, which was published in 1524–25, consists of four volumes, folio, as follows:—

---

[6] The Commentaries on Proverbs, Ezra, and Nehemiah are ascribed, in all the editions of the Rabbinic Bible, to Ibn Ezra. That this, however, is incorrect, and that they belong to Moses Kimchi, is now established beyond the shadow of a doubt. Comp. Reifmann in *Literaturblatt des Orients*, vol. ii., pp. 750, 751; *Zion*, vol. i., p. 76; vol. ii., pp. 113–117, 129–133, 155–157, 171–174, 185–188: Frankfort-on-the-Maine, 1841, 1842. Geiger, *Ozar Nechmad*, vol. ii., p. 17, &c.; Vienna, 1857; Kitto's *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*, *s.v.* KIMCHI, MOSES.

I. *The first volume*, embracing the Pentateuch (תורה), begins—i. With the elaborate Introduction of Jacob b. Chajim, which we now give for the first time with an English translation;[5] ii. An Index to the sections of the entire Old Testament according to the Massorah; and iii. Ibn Ezra's Preface to the Pentateuch. Then follow the five Books of Moses in Hebrew, with the so-called Chaldee Paraphrases of Onkelos and Jonathan ben Uzziel, and the Commentaries of Rashi and Ibn Ezra, which are given all round the margin; The Massorah parva, which is in the centre between the Hebrew text and the Chaldee paraphrase; and such a portion of the Massorah magna as the space between the end of the text and the beginning of the commentaries on each page would admit; for which reason this portion obtained the name of *Massorah marginalis.*

II. *The second volume*, comprising the Earlier Prophets (נביאים ראשונים), *i. e.*, Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, and 1 and 2 Kings, has the Hebrew text, the Chaldee paraphrases of Jonathan b. Uzziel, the Commentaries of Rashi, David Kimchi, and Levi ben Gershon, the Massorah parva, and that portion of the Massorah magna which constitutes the *Massorah marginalis.*

III. *The third volume*, comprising the Later Prophets (נביאים אחרונים), *i. e.*, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve Minor Prophets, has the Hebrew text, the so-called Chaldee paraphrase of Jonathan ben Uzziel, the Commentaries of Rashi, which extend over all the books in the volume of Ibn Ezra on Isaiah appealed to for the rule of faith and practice, Jacob Ibn Adonijah was studiously engaged in the collation of Biblical MSS., in compiling the grand critico-exegetical apparatus of the Old Testament, bequeathed to us by the Jews of olden times, and in editing it, together with the Hebrew Scriptures, the ancient Chaldee paraphrases, and valuable Hebrew commentaries, which has contributed more to the advancement of Biblical knowledge than all the bitter controversies of Catholics and Protestants.

---

[5] Fürst's assertion (*Bibliotheca Judaica*, iii. 454), that this introduction had been translated into English, and published by Kennicott in his work entitled *The state of the printed Hebrew Text of the Old Testament*, Oxford, 1758, is incorrect. Kennicott simply published an abridged and incorrect *Latin* version, from a MS. which he found in the Bodleian Library.

Before, however, we describe this gigantic Rabbinic Bible which has immortalised his name, we have to mention other important works edited by him. It has already been remarked, that Ibn Adonijah must have taken up his abode at Venice soon after Bomberg established in it his celebrated printing office (1516). For we find that the *editio princeps* of the entire Babylonian Talmud, published by Bomberg in 1520–1523, was partly edited by Jacob b. Chajim; and as the Talmud consists of twelve volumes folio, the preparations for its printing, and the printing itself, must have commenced a considerable time before 1520, when a portion of it was published. Hence his work and connection with Bomberg must have begun about 1517 or 1518. This conclusion is confirmed by the fact that, simultaneously with the appearance of the Babylonian Talmud, Ibn Adonijah also worked at the *editio princeps* of the Jerusalem Talmud, which he carried through the press in 1522–23, as well as at the *editio princeps* of R. Nathan's Hebrew Concordance, which appeared in 1523, and over which he must have spent a considerable time.

His assiduity was truly marvellous. He not only carried through the press in three years the first editions of these gigantic works, consisting of fourteen volumes folio, closely printed, both in square Hebrew characters and Rabbinic Hebrew, and replete with references, the very sight of which would astound any one who is not acquainted with them; but, within twelve months after the appearance of the Concordance, he edited, conjointly with David de Pizzightone, the stupendous legal and ritual code of Maimonides, entitled, *Mishne Thora* (משנה תורה) = *Deuteronomy*, *Second Law*, or *Jad Ha-Chezaka*, (יד החזקה) = *The Mighty Hand*, in allusion to Deut. xxxiv. 12; and because the work consists of fourteen books (יד = 14). To this code, which appeared in 1524, in two volumes folio, Ibn Adonijah wrote an Introduction.

It is perfectly amazing, to find that the editing of these works, coast, nearly opposite Carthagena, had actually been captured (Sep. 13, 1505), consternation spread among the numerous Jewish communities in the cities of North Africa.

The consternation became still greater when they heard that Ximenes, mounted upon a mule, had triumphantly entered Oran (May 17, 1509), preceded by a Franciscan friar, and followed by a cavalcade of brethren of the same monastic order, bearing aloft the massive silver cross, the archiepiscopal standard of Toledo, and banners emblazoned with the Primate's arms on one side, and the Cross on the other. All their fears were more than realised when, after the return of Ximenes to Spain, Pedro Navarro, the general of the army, had vanquished Bugia (Jan. 31, 1510), when Tunis had to capitulate, and when they saw the banner of the Cross floating triumphant from the walls of almost every Moslem city on the Mediterranean. It was then that Jacob b. Chajim, Saccutto, and a host of other eminent Jewish scholars were despoiled of their possessions, banished from their homes and families, interrupted in their most important works in the cause of Biblical literature, and driven to wander in exile.

For more than seven years (1510–1517) Ibn Adonijah roamed about homeless in the different towns of Italy, where at that time Hebrew literature was greatly cultivated and patronised by the highest of the land; and where popes and cardinals, princes and statesmen, warriors and recluses of all kinds were in search of Jewish teachers, in order to be instructed in the mysteries of the Kabbalah. Whether it was owing to his conscientious scruples, which would not allow him to initiate Gentiles into this esoteric doctrine, or to his not having been so fortunate in tuition as his contemporary, Elias Levita, he had at first to endure great privations during his sojourn in Rome and Florence. He at last went to Venice, where the celebrated Daniel Bomberg, of Antwerp, had at that very time established his famous Hebrew press (1516), and through the exertions of R. Chajim Alton, whom he honourably mentions in the Introduction, he at once became connected with the printing office.

The connection of so profound and assiduous a scholar with so cultivated and spirited a publisher proved one of the greatest benefits to Biblical literature, at the time of the Church's greatest need. For whilst the followers of the Prince of Peace were arrayed against each other in deadly conflict, to decide by the sword whether the Bible alone, or the infallible vicar of Christ on earth, is to be that province,—who at an advanced age studied Arabic, and caused a vocabulary, grammar, and catechism to be compiled, and a version of the liturgy to be made in the same tongue,—had produced few proselytes. He first employed arguments and presents; if these failed to convince the Mussulman of the error of his ways, imprisonment, with fetters, and a few days' fasting, soon humbled the unbeliever; so much so, that the devout Ferreras was constrained to exclaim, "Thus did Providence avail itself of the darkness of the dungeon to pour on the benighted minds of the infidel the light of the true faith."[4]

Effectually to extirpate heresy, and to preclude the possibility of the converts returning to their former errors, Cardinal Ximenes caused all procurable Arabic manuscripts to be piled together and burned, in one of the great squares of the city, so as to exterminate the very characters in which the teachings of the infidels were recorded. This outrageous burning of most valuable MSS., relating to all branches of science and literature, was effected by the learned Prelate at the very time that he was spending a princely fortune in the publication of the stupendous Complutensian Polyglott, and in the erection and endowment of the university of Alcalá, which was the most learned in Spain. From the thousands of MSS. destined for the conflagration, Ximenes indeed reserved three hundred, relating to medical science, for his university.

As to the Jews, their doom was sealed. In ordinary warfare it mattered very little to them whether the Christians vanquished the infidels, or the infidels the Christians, since the tribute levied by the conqueror upon the conquered was obtained by stripping the Israelites. In the present instance, however, they saw that those who won the day, and forced their religion by means of the sword upon the vanquished, were the very people from whom they themselves had suffered in an unparalleled degree; and that the victors were simply re-enacting the same deeds abroad which they perpetrated at home, upon those who were out of the pale of the Church. They expected again to be dragged from their peaceful homes in the name of Christ, as soon as the Spaniards had a respite from the Mussulman infidels. Hence when they heard that Ximenes, flushed with success at Granada, had instigated Ferdinand, immediately after the death of Isabella, to organise an expedition against the neighbouring Moslems of Africa, and that Mozarquivir, an important port on the Barbary be concluded that he was then at least fifty years of age, and that he was born about 1470. Whether his ancestors were among the first and second masses of emigrants from Spain, who successively fled from that accursed country, to escape the fiery persecution consequent upon the successive inflammatory preachings of the fanatical priests, Fernando Martinez (March 15—August 1391), and Vincente Ferrer (1412–1414), and settled down in the North of Africa by thousands; or whether they were among the three hundred thousand who were expelled from Spain in 1492, is difficult to decide. According to the former view, Ibn Adonijah, though of Spanish descent, was born at Tunis, whilst according to the latter, he emigrated with his parents into this city when about twenty-two years of age.

---

[4] Prescott, *History of the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella*, part ii., cap. 6.

Among those whom the cruel edict of Ferdinand and Isabella drove from their peaceful homes, and who sought an asylum at Tunis, were Abraham Saccutto, the celebrated astronomer and historian, and Moses b. Isaac Alashkar, the famous Kabbalist and philosopher. These, together with other distinguished literati, established schools at Tunis, and taught hundreds of students the different branches of Biblical and Talmudic literature. It was among these eminent men, and in their schools, that Jacob b. Chajim prosecuted his Hebrew studies, and acquired his extraordinary knowledge of the Massorah, thus preparing himself for the great work which Providence had in store for him elsewhere.

He was, however, not permitted to continue the enjoyment of his quiet home and peaceful studies under the hospitable protection of the Crescent. The bloody persecutors under the Cross, not satisfied with having deprived the whole Jewish population of Spain of all that is precious to men on earth, carried fire and sword, in the name of Christ, among the Jews who had obtained an asylum in Mohamedan countries, and who were diligently employed in the revival of Biblical literature. This time, however, the crusade was not originally organised against the Jews, but against the Moors, since it was believed to be base ingratitude to the goodness of Providence, which had delivered these infidels into the hands of the Church, to allow them any longer to usurp the fair inheritance of the Christians.

Hence no less a person than Cardinal Ximenes, the distinguished Archbishop of Toledo, resorted to Granada, in 1449, to convert the stiff-necked race of Mohamed; seeing that the rational and benevolent measures adopted by Fray Fernando de Talavera, the Archbishop of

JACOB B. CHAJIM IBN ADONIJAH.

Very little is known of the life of Jacob ben Chajim Ibn Adonijah, who rescued the Massorah from perdition, and for the first time collated, compiled, and gave to the world in a printed form the grand critico-exegetical apparatus, bequeathed to us by the Jews of olden times. Even the date and the place of his birth are matters of conjecture, and can only be approximately guessed from the autobiographical fragments scattered through his writings.

In his celebrated Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, which we publish with an English translation, he tells us that he was a resident of Tunis; and it is concluded, from this remark, that this ancient city was his native place. Hence he is also called *Tunisi*. Indeed Fürst, who, in his work on Hebrew Bibliography, treats on our author under the name *Jacob b. Chajim*, has also a second notice of him under *Tunisi*.[1] It is, however, to be remarked, that Jacob b. Chajim does not call Tunis his native place, but simply says that he resided in it and prosecuted his studies therein.[2] Nor must we omit to state that he calls himself Jacob *Ibn Adonijah*, and that this, or simply *Ibn Adonijah*, is the surname by which he is quoted in the writings of his learned contemporaries.[3] But though *Ibn Adonijah* is the more correct appellation, we shall not entirely discard the name Jacob b. Chajim, because he is better known by it in modern days.

From the fact that Jacob b. Chajim carried through the press of the celebrated Daniel Bomberg, at Venice, the complete editions of the Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmuds, in 1520–1523, it may reasonably an account of the Massorah, and a description of a newly discovered, and very important, MS. of this ancient critico-exegetical apparatus.

---

[1] Comp. *Bibliotheca Judaica*, vol. ii., p. 17, with vol. iii., p. 451.

[2] שלו הייתי בביתי ורענן בהיכלי שוקד על למודי בטונים המדינה אשר קרוב לקצה גבול קרטגינא הקדומה, *vide infra*, p. 38.

[3] Thus in this Introduction (*vide infra*, p. 36), and in the *Treatise on the Points and Accents* which is printed in the upper and lower margins of the *Massorah finalis*, he calls himself *Jacob b. Chajim b. Isaac Ibn Adonijah* (יעקב בן חיים בן יצחק ן׳ אדוניהו). Levita, in the poem at the end of the Bible, calls him *Jacob* [*Ibn*] *Adonijah* (יעקב אדוניה); whilst De Rossi (1513–1577), simply calls him *Ibn Adonijah* (ן׳ אדניהו). Comp. *Meor Enajim*, part iii., cap. lix., p. 471, ed. Cassel, Berlin, 1867.

If the Christian literary and scientific public should be inclined to manifest that interest in the criticism of the sacred text of the Old Testament which scholars have always evinced in securing correct texts of profane classics, I shall deem it a privilege to devote some years of my life to the publication and annotation of this newly discovered MS.

For the elaborate Indices, I am to a great extent indebted to a friend, whose name I am not at liberty to mention.

Brooklea, Aigburth Road,
Liverpool, *October*, 1867.

PREFACE.

Since the publication of the first edition of Jacob b. Chajim Ibn Adonijah's Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, with an English Translation, I have spent two years of almost uninterrupted study in Massoretic lore. When, therefore, called upon to issue a second edition, I determined to embody in it as much of the results of my researches as was required to elucidate the text and the translation.

The principal alterations in this edition are as follow: i. The present text is a reprint of the *editio princeps* (Venice, 1525), which I did not possess at first — carefully collated with the editions of 1546–48, 1568, 1617–19, 1619, and 1724–27. ii. The text has been carefully punctuated throughout. iii. The translation has been thoroughly revised and improved. iv. The Hebrew and the English are printed in parallel columns, so that the book may now be used as a help by those who are desirous to study Rabbinic Hebrew. v. The Annotations have been augmented from forty-two to upwards of a hundred. And vi. A life of Jacob b. Chajim has been added, with

TO

FRIEDRICH LUDWIG LEOPOLD HAUSBURG,

I affectionately Inscribe this Work,

CHRISTIAN D. GINSBURG.

הקדמת

יעקב בן חיים ן׳ אדוניהו

הנמצאת

במקראות גדולות

הנקראות בשם שער יהוה הקדוש דפוס ויניציא שנת תרפ״ו

עם תיקונים שונים

על פי מקראות גדולות דפוס הש״ז ודפוס השכ״ח

ונוסף

עליה תרגום, באור, ותולדת המחבר

בשפת ענגליש

מאת אוהב שפת קודש ומכבד מכבדיה

כריסטיאן דוד גינצבורג

לונדון
שנת תר״כה

✓

JACOB BEN CHAJIM IBN ADONIJAH'S

INTRODUCTION

TO

THE RABBINIC BIBLE,

HEBREW AND ENGLISH;

WITH EXPLANATORY NOTES.

BY

CHRISTIAN D. GINSBURG, LL.D.

Second Edition.

LONDON:
LONGMANS, GREEN, READER, AND DYER.
1867.

DATE DUE

JUL [redacted]94

Demco, Inc. 38-293

11.19.'02

From the Library of

Professor William Henry Green

Bequeathed by him to

the Library of

Princeton Theological Seminary

BS18
.J15
copy 1.

BS18 .J15
Introduction to the rabbinic Bible
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00044 9035